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EACHARD, John, D.D., b. in Suffolk, 1858; d. as Master of Catherine Hall, in Cambridge, July 7, 1897. He is famous for his essay on The grounds and occasions of the contempt of the clergy and religion, inquired into in a letter to R. L. (1870), with its sequel, Observations on An Answer to the Inquiry, in a second letter to the same (1871), and for his vigorous attacks upon Thomas Hobbes. He was master of a light, bantering, satirical style, which was very effective. He attributed the failure of the clergy to their defective education, small salaries, and lack of spirituality, and illustrated these points very humorously. His Works were published, London, 1875, best edition, 1844, 8 vols., with account of his life and writings.

EADFRID, Bishop of Lindisfarne 698—721, wrote the Durham Book, or Lindisfarne Gospels, to which Aldred added an interlinear gloss in the Anglo-Northumbrian dialect. The manuscript, which is one of the most beautiful in Europe, and noticed by every writer on paleography, is preserved among the Cottonian manuscripts of the British Museum, and has been edited by Stevenson and Waring for the Surtees Society, and by Kemble, Hardwick, and Skeat, for the Syndics of the University of Cambridge. The gloss has been printed by Karl Bouterwek: Die vier Evangelien in altnorthumbrischer Sprache, 1857.

EADIE, John, D.D., LL.D., pastor, professor of theology, and commentator on some of the Pauline Epistles; b. at Alva, Stirlingshire, Scotland, May 9, 1810; d. at Glasgow, Saturday, June 3, 1876. He was educated at the University of Glasgow and in the theological seminary of the United Secession, now United Presbyterian, Church. He was ordained, on Sept. 21, 1835, to the pastorate of the Cambridge-street Church, Glasgow, which he retained until, in 1853, he removed, with a portion of his people, to form the new Lansdowne church, of which he was minister until his death. As early as his student days, he showed his leaning to the department in which he achieved his greatest success by writing an able article in the Edinburgh Theological Magazine for 1839, in a review of Moses Stuart’s commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews; and he had so diligently given himself to biblical study in later years, that, on the death of Dr. John Mitchell, he was elected by the synod of his church (May 5, 1843) to the professorship of biblical literature in its divinity hall. Such an appointment at that time did not involve, as it now does, the dissolution of the pastoral relationship; for then the seminary sat for only two months in the year, those of August and September, and the professors were at once pastors and professors. But in the professorship Eadie found the great sphere of his life, and now began that course of industry which resulted in the extensive authorship which is indicated below. He held the offices of pastor and professor for thirty-three years: and just after the synod had decided to remodel its theological seminary by lengthening its annual session from two to five months, shortening its curriculum from five to three years, increasing its corps of professors, and dissolving the relationship between them and their congregations, he died, on the 3d of June, 1876.

As a preacher, Eadie was satisfying rather than striking. His manner was not elegant, and his utterance was often thick; but he was always, like Elijah, “full of matter,” and one could not listen to him without learning much at his lips. He was especially excellent as an expositor, and frequently by a few clear sentences cast a flood of light upon a difficult portion of the word of God. As a professor he was affable, easy, and natural, “wearing his load of learning lightly like a flower,” and possessing that magnetic influence which quickened all his students into enthusiasm. His scholarship was extensive and accurate, and was so generally recognized, that he was chosen as a member of the New-Testament company to whom was committed the preparation of the Canterbury revision of the English Bible. His commentaries are distinguished for candor and clearness, and above all for an evangelical “unction” not common in works of the kind, and which may, perhaps, be accounted for from the fact, that, while he was poring over these epistles in his study, he was also discoursing on them from his pulpit. His influence gave an immense impulse to biblical exegesis in the denomination to which he belonged, and indeed to Scotland generally. He received the degree of L.L.D. from the University of Glasgow in 1844, and that of D.D. from the University of St. Andrews in 1850.

Lit. — Besides contributions to the Eclectic and North British Reviews, and Kitto’s Journal of Sacred Literature, Dr. Eadie did an immense amount of literary work in connection with McKenzie’s Imperial Dictionary of Universal Biography (in which he had charge of the department of ecclesiastical biography), with the first and last (3d) editions of Kitto’s Cyclopædia, and with Fairbairn’s Imperial Bible Dictionary. He prepared an excellent Concordance to the Scriptures on the Basis of Cruden (1830), and compiled the series published in Edinburgh, and very widely circulated, The Bible Cyclopædia (1848, based upon The Union Bible Dictionary, Phila., in condensed form, under the caption Dictionary of the Holy Bible for the Young; new ed. of the Cyclopædia, entirely re-written, 1860); An Analytic Concordance to the Holy Scriptures (1855); and The Ecclesiastical Cyclopædia (1861). He published two volumes of discourses, The Divine Love (1855), and Paul the Preacher (1859). But his fame rests on his commentaries on the Greek text of Ephesians (1854), Galatians (1856), Galatians (1859), and, published posthumously, on First Thessalonians (1877). In addition must be mentioned his interesting biographies of John Kitto (1857) and William Wilson, his posthumous treatise on Scripture Illustrations from the Domestic
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EADMER, monk in Canterbury; was elected Bishop of St. Andrews in 1120, but never took possession of the see, on account of disagreement with King Alexander, and died in Canterbury, 1124. He is one of the most important English historians of the period, and wrote: I. Historia Novorum, in six books, giving the history of the three archbishops of Canterbury, Lanfranc, Anselm, and Radulf, edited by Selden, London, 1623, reprinted in Gerberon's edition of Anselm's works, Paris, 1873; II. The Life of Anselm, edited by Surius and the Bollandists, April 21; III. Two letters to the monks of Glastonbury about the life of St. Dunstan, and to the monks of Winchester about episcopal election; IV. The Lives of St. Bregwin, St. Oswald, and St. Odo, edited in Wharton's Anglia Sacra; V. The Life of St. Wilfrid of York, reprinted in the Festival of St. Wilfrid, April 29; VI. Finally, some minor works, hitherto wrongly ascribed to Anselm. His collected works are found in Migne: Patrof., CLIX., pp. 315 sqq.

EADMUND, or EDMUND, king and martyr; was b. in 840, and ascended the throne of East Anglia in 855, when King Offa abdicated, and retired to Rome as a penitent. Edmund ruled in meekness, was the shelter of the weak, learned the psaltery by heart, and made his whole life a preparation for martyrdom. In 870 the heathen Danes landed in East Anglia, slew the clergy, outraged the nuns, burnt and pillaged churches and houses. Edmund tried to stem the flood, but was overwhelmed, taken prisoner, tortured, and finally beheaded, Nov. 29, 870. His remains were interred at Bury St. Edmunds, and miracles were wrought at his grave. In 1020 Canute the Great built them a magnificent church and abbey at Soissey Nov. 16, 1240; studied at Oxford and Paris, and became a teacher at Oxford, treasurer of Salisbury Cathedral (1222), and Archbishop of Canterbury (1233). But Edmund belonged to the national party, and was consequently in opposition to the king; and, when the king succeeded in having a papal legate sent to England to neutralize the influence of the archbishop, Edmund found himself in opposition also to the Pope. He fought manfully, but was at last compelled to yield. He left England in 1240, and settled, first at Pontigny, then at Soissey, where he died, Nov. 16, same year. He had adopted and practised asceticism since a boy: b. 1004; crowned King at Winchester, April 3, 1043; d. at Shene Jan. 5, 1066.

EASTER. The Hebrew mizraḥ and kədəm are both translated "east." The first means literally rising (i.e., of the sun), and therefore indicates the place of the sun's rising; answering to ʿawārīd and orient, and means the east in distinction from the west (Josh. xi. 3; Ps. l. 1, ciii. 12; Zech. viii. 7). Kədəm means rather the east as one of the four quarters of the globe (Gen. xiii. 14; Job xxiii. 8, 9; Ezek. xlvii. 18 sqq.). Each term has a secondary or derivative meaning. Kədəm is the proper name for the countries on the immediate east of the Holy Land; while mizraḥ designates the far east (Isa. xii. 2, 25, xlii. 6, xlvi. 11).

EAST, Praying towards, a custom of the early church. It evoked the charge that the Christians were sun-worshippers (Tertullian, Apol., 10). Augustine (De Serm. in Monte, lii. 5) speaks of it as a general custom: sum ad orationem stamus, ad orientem convertimus ("when we rise for prayer, we turn toward the east"). The reason usually given was, that the rising of the sun is the type of the rising of the new life, and Christ is called the "Day-spring from on high" (Clem. Alex., Stromata, viii. 7). Other reasons mentioned were, that thereby the soul utters its longing after the lost Paradise (Basil, De Sp. Sancto, 27), or that Christ will appear in the East when he comes again the second time (Matt. xxv. 27). The practice has been revived by some of the ritualists of the Episcopal Church. The influence of the last reason mentioned for praying towards the east is felt in the practice of burying the dead with their feet turned in that direction. The Jews in exile turned their faces toward Jerusalem when they prayed (Dan. vi. 10); and the Mohammedans face Mecca, the holy city.

EASTER, the festival of our Lord's resurrection, and with Christmas the most joyous day observed by the Church. Term.—The term is derived from the Saxon ostara, or Oostre (German Ostern), the goddess of spring. The French designation paques preserves a reference to the Jewish pascha, or passover. In the early church, paša signifies the festival of Christ's crucifixion. After the second century (Neander, Hilgenfeld, etc.), or, according to others, after the third or fourth (Steitz), it designated both the festival of the crucifixion and the resurrection (πάσχα σταυροφορίαν και ανάστασιν). Subsequently the term was limited to the latter. Only in a single instance is the original rendered Easter (Acts 21:4) in our version; in all other cases, passover. The Revised Version has rectified this inconsistency in translation.

Date. — In the early church there was no uniformity in the day observed (Epiphan., lxx., LX.); Bede at a later date makes frequent
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reference to this discrepancy, and mentions, that, while Queen Eanfelda was keeping Palm Sunday, King Oswy was observing Easter (about 651). The present (or Nicene) rule seems to have been adopted in England by Archbishop Theodore, in 660. The party called the Quattodecimani, or Fourteeners (Greek Tetradekia and Tetradeksa- titai) observed the day (of crucifixion) on the 14th of Nisan, no matter on what day of the week it fell. The Western Church departed from this custom; and Polycarp, on a visit to Rome (154), endeavored in vain to persuade Anicetus to adopt the quartodeciman mode. Victor of Rome (197) was only restrained by public opinion, and the protests of Ireneus, from excommunicating the Quattodecimans, so grave an offence was it considered to observe the 14th. The Council of Nicaea (325) decreed that there should be uniformity in the date of observance. It is not in place here to go further into the question of the ancient controversy on the date of Easter. See art. PASCHAL CONTROVERSIES. It is, however, proper to state the results of the decree of Nicaea which determines our date of Easter. By that decree, it is fixed on the Sunday immediately following the fourteenth day of the so-called Paschal moon, which happens on or first after the vernal equinox. The vernal equinox invariably falls on March 21. Easter, then, cannot occur earlier than March 22, or later than April 25. In the former case the fourteenth day of the moon would coincide with March 21, the day of the vernal equinox. In the latter, the fifteenth day of the moon would not occur till seven more days had elapsed, i.e., April 25.

Celebration.—The key of the observance of Easter is set in the exultant strain of St. Paul, "Now is Christ risen!" (1 Cor. xv. 20). The ancient church celebrated it with solemnity and joyous observances. The Fastings which had begun on Good Friday was discontinued on Saturday, at midnight (89th Trullan Canon) or at the cock-crow on sabbath morning (Apost. Const., v. 18). Gregory Nazianzen (d. 391) and Gregory of Nyssa (d. 397; Orat. xiii. De Pascha) speak of persons of all ranks carrying lamps and setting up tapers on Easter Eve. This custom was significant of the vigils which were kept (Lactant., Div. Inst., vii. 19) in the expectation that the Lord at his coming again would appear at this time. Easter Eve was also set apart as a special season for the baptism of catechumens. Easter Day itself was set apart as a sacred place on the top of Ebal. The modern Nablus (the ancient Shechem) is situated in the valley.

EBBO, Archbishop of Rheims; b. 788; d. March 20, 851; was the son of a serf, but the foster-brother of Louis the Pious, and was given freedom by Charlemagne; educated in a cloister school, ordained priest, and appointed to some ecclesiastical position at the imperial court. Louis the Pious made him Archbishop of Rheims in 816; and in 822 he assumed the lead of the Danish mission. He visited Denmark twice; and it was no doubt due to him that the Danish king, Harold Klak, when heavily pressed by domestic foes, sought refuge at the Frankish court, was baptized, and returned with Ansgar in his retinue. But there is no evidence, except his own words (Apologia Archiepiscopi Remensis cum ejusdem genae septemtrionale legatione),
that he did anything for the introduction of Christianity in Denmark, beyond cunning utilization of confused political circumstances. He was a political man, and more so to the kind in his native country. Though he owed every thing to Louis the Pious, he deserted him as soon as it became apparent, that, in the contest with his three sons, the sons had the ascendency. When the armies met at Colmar, Ebbo did what he could in order to allure people away, by bribes and by threats, from the camp of Louis; and when the battle was lost, and the poor emperor was condemned to make public penance, Ebbo was there to take off his golden arms, and lay on the sackcloth and ashes, announcing to the world that he was thereby incapacitated to reign. But there came a turn in the affairs. Louis the Pious once more was in power; and Ebbo hastened to the diet of Duedenhofen (885) to be reconciled to him. The emperor was too angry, however. He threw the archbishop into a dungeon at Fulda; and there he lay, in spite of the Pope's protest, till the death of Louis (840). Lothair the German, who, however, had only a pittance of Eden, a collection of fifty poems (comp. tracts on the sciences; a book on the philosophy of Hildesheim. Besides the above Apologia, was converted to Romanism. R. GOSCHE.

EBED JESU (Syrian, "Servant of God"), surnamed Bar Brita ("Son of the Blessed"), a Nestorian theologian of comprehensive scholarship; was born in the middle of the thirteenth century, in Gozarta, an island in the Tigris; became early Bishop of Sinhar and Arabia, and was, between 1235 and 1257, made metropolitan of Nisibis, or Zoba, where he died in the beginning of November, 1318. He left twenty works: one, exegetical, on the Old and New Testaments (not allegorical, as often stated); three, dogmatical, on the incarnation of the Logos, on the sacraments, and on the verity of the faith (edited in Syriac and Latin by A. Mai, in Script. Vet., 10, 317-366); several works referring to canon law; The Paradise of Eden, a collection of fifty poems (comp. Assemani, Bibl. Or., 3, 1, p. 323); twelve poetical tracts on the sciences; a book on the philosophy of the Greeks; a rhymed catalogue of two hundred Syrian authors (Assemani, Bibl. Or., 3, 1, p. 1-362), enumerating also his own works.

Different from this Ebéd Jeu is another Nestorian patriarch of the same name, who in 1562 was converted to Romanism. R. GOSCHE.

EBEL. 689

EBEL, Johannes Wilhelm, or., b. March 4, 1810, at Posen, and died March 15, 1881, at Hohenbeck-in-Württemberg. After his graduation at Königsberg, he became acquainted with Johann Heinrich Schönherr one of the most original thinkers of the period, and espoused his views of relative dualism (see SCHÖNHERR). His pro-
EBER, Paul. b. at Kitzingen, Franconia, Nov. 8, 1511; d. at Wittenberg, Dec. 10, 1569; was educated at Ansbach and Nuremberg, and entered in 1532 the University of Wittenberg, where he gradually formed an intimate connection with Melanchthon, that was called Philippis Repertrium. In 1541 he was appointed professor in Latin grammar, and began to lecture on the whole range of the ars liberales, publishing a handbook of Jewish history, a historical calendar, destined to supplant the calendar of Roman saints, etc. In 1557 he was made professor of the Old Testament, and in 1558 superintendent-general of the whole electorate. During the last years of his life he devoted himself almost exclusively to theology, and took part in the various theological controversies and disputes of the time, though essentially as a mediator. His Biblia Latina, a correction of the Latin translation of the Old Testament, he himself considered as his principal work. See SIXTE: Paul Eber, Freund und Amtsgenosse der Reformatoren, 1843, and Paul Eber, ein Stück Wittenberger Lebens, 1857; PRESSEL: Paul Eber, in Vater und Begründer der luther. Kirche. VIII., 1862.  

EBERLHIN, Johann, b. at Günzburg, in Suabia, in the second half of the fifteenth century; d. 1530; studied philology and philosophy at Basel; entered the order of the Franciscans, and was appointed preacher in their monastery at Tübingen, but afterwards removed to Ulm on account of disagreement with his superiors. In Ulm he became acquainted with the writings of Luther, and began to preach the views of the reformers. Consulled to leave the city, he went to Switzerland, where he wrote his first book, Die fünfzehn Bundegenseissen, 1521, dedicated to Charles V. After a stay in Wittenberg (1521-23), where he became intimately acquainted with Luther and Melanchthon, he proceeded to Basel and Ulm, preaching and publishing pamphlets in the spirit of the Reformation. During a second visit to Wittenberg he published his Wie sich eyn Diener Gottes worten ynn all segemen Bun halten sollt, etc., a book which, in the last years of his life, he spent in Thuringia, steadily working with energy and success, though in his own independent and original way, for the cause of the Reformation. See BERNHARD RIEGENBACH: Johann Eberlin von Günzburg und sein Reformatprogramm, Tübingen, encyclopaedia and church-history to correct the slanderous and false notices which twenty years ago disfigured their pages. — An article on the Religious Suit may be seen in the Bibliotheca Sacra, 1869, vol. XXVI., No. 104, and the full history in my Life of Ebel, London and New York, 1882. — The most important of the works of Ebel are: Die Weisheit von Oben, 1823, 2d ed., Basel, etc., enlarged, 1869; Die Treue, 1835, 2d ed., ibid., 1868; Gellische Erziehung, Hamburg, 1825, in English, 1825; Die apostolische Predigt in zeitgemäsß, Hamburg, 1835; Verstand und Vernunft (by DIESTEL and EBEL), Leipzig, 1837; Zeugniss der Wahrheit (by the same), ib., 1838; Grundzüge der Erkenntnis der Wahrheit, ib., 1852; Die Philosophie der heiligen Urkunde des Christenthums, Stuttgart, 1854–56; Compa de route, containing extracts from most of these works, and also from the Liebe zur Wahrheit. See also s.v. SCHÖNHERR. J. I. MÖNBERT.

EBIONITES. This designation was at first, like "Nazarenes," a common name for all Christians, as Epiphanius (d. 403) testifies (Adv. Herr., xxix. 1). It is derived from the Hebrew ינוי, "poor," and was not given, as Origen supposes, in reference to their low views of Christ, but to their own poverty. This poverty, especially characteristic of the Christians of Jerusalem, evoked from the Pagans and Jewish world the contemptuous appellation of "the poor." Minutius Felix says, "That we are called the poor is not our disgrace, but our glory" (Octes., 88). Subsequently its application was limited to Jewish Christians. "The Jews who accept Christ are called Ebionites," writes Origen (c. Cels., II. 1). Then, when a portion of the Jewish Church became separate and heretical, the designation was used exclusively of it. Later in the fourth century Epiphanius, Jerome, and others use it of a separate party within the Jewish Church distinct from the Nazarenes. This outline of history proves that Tertullian was wrong when he derived the term from a pretended founder of the sect called Ebon. The notices in the early fathers are fragmentary, and at times seem to be contradictory on account of the double application of the term, now to Jewish Christianity as a whole, now to a party within it. The New Testament knows of no sects in the Jewish Church, but indicates the existence of different tendencies. At the Council of Jerusalem a legalistic and Judaizing spirit manifested itself, which was in antagonism to the spirit of Paul, and was shown in the Judaizing teachings which did so much mischief in the Galatian churches. But it was not until after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the founding of Aelia Capitolina by Hadrian, in 134, that Jewish Christianity became a distinct school, gradually becoming more and more heretical till it separated into the two sects of Ebionites proper and Nazarenes. The latter still held to Paul as an apostle, and, while they kept the law themselves, did not demand its observance of the Gentile Christians. The former held the observance of the law to be obligatory upon all Christians alike, and rejected Paul as an apostle. This was the state of affairs at the time of Justin Martyr (Dial. c. Tryph., 47). Irenaeus, who does not mention this party division, describes the Ebionites as stubbornly clinging to the law, as rejecting the apostle Paul as an apostate, and all the Gospels except Matthew. He further notices a christological heresy. Denying Christ's birth from the Virgin, they regarded him as a mere man. Origen (c. Cels., V. 81) distinguishes between two branches of Ebionites, those who denied and those who accepted the miraculous birth. Here the distinction between Nazarenes and the Ebionites proper becomes less apparent. See the latter, faced, Basel and Ulm, preaching and publishing pamphlets in the spirit of the Reformation.
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Ecclesiastes were chiliasm (Jerome ad. Exod., 35, 1). In Epiphanius’ day (d. 403) they dwelt principally in the regions along the Dead Sea, but also in Rome and Cyprus. The disintegration of Jewish Christianity was succeeded by the introduction of Gnostic philosophy, of Greek culture, as also, perhaps, of Oriental theosophy. See the art. Elkesiates.


EBRARD OF BETHUNE, a place in Artois, lived in the latter part of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth century, and acquired a name as a writer on grammar and theology. Of his personal life nothing is known. His two known works are, Grecimus, a poem of two thousand verses, on grammar, prosody, rhetoric, etc., used for a longtime as a handbook in the schools; and Aristarchus, a refutation of the heresies of the Cathari, at that time still important as a source of information concerning the doctrines of the Cathari, was first printed by the Jesuit Gretser, under the title "Aristarchus," and the authorship doubtful. C. Schmidt.

The name occurs often in Greek (Herodotus, i. 2—4), is the same with the Ecbatana which was the summer residence of the Persian kings, whose magnificent fortifications are described by Strabo (viii. 8, 2, 3 and 4 Macc. ix. 3, etc.). It was, however, applied to several different places; and the question has been discussed whether the Ecbatana, whose magnificent fortifications are described by Herodotus (i. 98, 99), and in the Book of Judith (i. 2—4), is the same with the Ecbatana which was the summer residence of the Persian kings, the modern Hamadan, and, if not, which of the two is the Hebrew Achmetha. Sir H. Rawlinson has sought to place the former at Talch-i Suleiman, to the north of Hamadan, where there are remarkable ruins, and where topographical features are thought to favor Herodotus’ description. There is, however, no evidence from the cuneiform inscriptions that the Agamatanu, the royal city of Astyages, which Cyrus captured (Herodotus, iii. 71, 72; Soc. Bib. Arch., vii.), was the Agamatanu of Darius (Behistun Inscr. 60); and the identity of this with the old Median capital on the one hand, and with Achmetha on the other, is probably to be maintained. In the autumn of B.C. 324, after the battle of Arbela, Alexander the Great spent some months in Ecbatana, and edited the Arab text of the third Book of the Maccabees, which lasted from 1640 to about 1653, though with interruptions. He furnished the Syriac, Arab, and Latin texts of the Book of Ruth, and the Arab text of the third Book of the Maccabees. He also undertook a revision of the labor of his predecessor, Gabriel Sionita; but this revision brought upon him a very severe criticism by Valerian de Flavigny (Paris, 1646), to which, however, he gave a very sharp answer (Paris, 1647). Comp. Masch: Bibl. Sacra, 1, 387 sqq. Among his independent works are: a Syriac handbook, Rome, 1829; Eutychius Patriarchus Alexandrinus vindicus, Rome, 1647; a defence of the episcopacy, directed against J. Selden; an edition of the letters and sermons of Anthony, Paris, 1641 and 1646; an edition of the Chronicon Orientale of Ibu-ar-Rabb, Paris, 1653; Concordantia nationum Christ. Orient. in fidei catholicae dogmata, Mayence, 1655 (together with Leo Allius), etc. Assemani’s verdict on him is severe but not undeserved. R. Gobie.

ECCLESIA. See Church.

ECCLESIASTES (ἐκκλησίαται), Ecclesiastes.

1. Title. — "The Book of Koheleth, the son of David, King in Jerusalem" (i. 1). The word Koheleth is the feminine participle of Kůhālāl, "to call together," "to assemble." Though feminine in form, which does not necessarily imply that the writer wished to identify himself with Wisdom (cf. Prov. 1. 20), it is masculine in meaning, following the analogy of Sophereth (Ez. ii. 57), Pochereth (Ez. ii. 57), Alemeth, and Azzaveth (1 Chr. viii. 30). It is interpreted "preacher" (as if in the Hiphil, one who addresses an assembly, "Septuagint, the Vulgate, and Modern Versions"); "debater" (one who is a member of an assembly), "collector" (i.e., of different opinions), "gatherer" (i.e., of an assembly).

2. Author. — (1) Solomon. — This is the tradi-
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Socratic, while it is eminently fit for pithy, sentences. "I have been king in Jerusalem" (1.12), and in many allusions (i. 16, ii., xii. 9, etc.); (e) the lack of agreement among critics as to date and authorship, if the Solomonic view be given up; (f) the natural desire to find some confession of repentance from one who so flagrantly disobeyed the elementary truths of Judaism; (g) the Aramaic cast is much too little of the ramifications and connections of Hebrew with cognate dialects to make the argument of much weight either way; (c) the author's use of the past tense ("I was king," etc.) is happily paralleled by Mr. Bullock's quotation (Speaker's Com., iv. p. 623) of the language of Louis XIV. in his old age, — quand je suis roi ("when I was king"); (d) the allusion to those who had been before the writer (i. 16) is quite easily interpreted of the "long line of debauches," kings: "none of them all have been outside of Judaism, nor was Solomon responsible for them all; (f) and (g) do not materially weaken the Solomonic origin theory.

The advocates of this theory emphasize the point that no other Hebrew than Solomon answers the descriptions given of the man, in which the unnamed author lived, nor is known to have possessed so rich an experience.

4. Plan.—Again, there is no agreement.

Some (like Zöckler) maintain that it is a formal treatise; others, that it is a collection of unconnected thoughts and maxims (Luther), like the Meditations of Marcus Aurelius, or Pascal's Thoughts; or a colloquy between a seeker and a teacher (Herder). One of the most elaborate attempts to analyze the book is Zöckler's. He maintains that it contains four discourses, of about equal length, upon the vanity of all human relations, destinies, and efforts: 1 (i. and ii.) Knowledge and enjoyment alike fail of their end; 2 (iii.-v.) The highest good is to enjoy this life and its pleasures, and the practical wisdom of life consists of patience, contempt of the world, and fear of God; 3 (vi.-viii.) The only true happiness springs from benevolence, fidelity to duty, a contented and serene enjoyment of life, and sincere fear of God; 4 (viii. 16-xii. 7) The only true happiness springs from benevolence, fidelity to duty, a contented and serene enjoyment of life, and sincere fear of God from early youth to advanced age. To these latter parts the learned of the Stoics and Epicureans refer (Comm. pp. 30-34).

To these arguments the defenders of the traditional view reply: (a) The age of the opinion, which is strong a priori evidence in its favor; (b) The eminent fitness of Solomon to write this book, because of his divine wisdom and wide experience; (c) The style and diction belong to the golden age of Hebrew literature (so, e.g., authorities like Taylor and others); (d) The claim of the book itself, not made, is true, in so many words (i.e., Koheleth does not say he was Solomon), but still made in the very title, in the sentence, "I was king over Israel in Jerusalem" (i. 12), and in many allusions (i. 16, ii., xii. 9, etc.); (e) The vocabulary is of an Aramaic cast; (f) The author's allusions to prevalent corruptions (iv. 1, v. 8, vili. 9, x. 5) are those of a student of life, and not of a king directly responsible for such abuses; (g) The reader is a wise and elegant man when he wrote the former treatise; others, that it is a collection of uncon
tent of his teachings. Zickler, following other commentators, divides each of these discourses into almost as many subdivisions as there are verses, or groups of verses, in the book. Zickler, following other commentators, divides each of these discourses into almost as many subdivisions as there are verses, or groups of verses, in the book. He finds the secret of its life. Taken thus as a whole, it may be considered as a confession written in prose, yet with a rhythmical flow (sufficient to justify Thomas Lewis in making it a rhetorical version of it), devoid of plan, except so far as it is a continuous unburdening of self. Its unity is in its authorship and theme,—the vanity of life. Its contents are miscellaneous illustrations of the theme, derived from experience, and told with great sadness. It is because the book is thus a collection of observations, that some interpret the title, Kohelet by "collector."

5. Character and Tendency.—Many advocates of the Solomonic hypothesis find in the book evidence of his change of heart. But, whether Solomon be the author or not, it will be probably best to consider it as a unique exhibition of Hebrew scepticism, subdued and checked by the Hebrew fear of God, and reaping lessons of wisdom from the follies of life. The tone is sad. On every side the writer sees persistent and gigantic evil. Nothing turns out as he would like. "O vanity of vanities, all is vanity." And yet the conviction is fixed that it is always right to do right; and, in view of the coming judgment (xi. 9), the book closes with this memorable sentence: "Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is all of man." Such a book is edifying rather than enlivening reading. Its facts are undeniable; but they are depressing, and represent only the dark side. There is no glad recognition of the glorious outcome of all the ills of life. Ecclesiastes has its place in the canon of Holy Scripture. It puts more vividly than in any other way the vanities of all is vanity. "And et the conviction was fixed that it is always right to do right; and, in view of the coming judgment (xi. 9), the book closes with this memorable sentence: "Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is all of man." Such a book is edifying rather than enlivening reading. Its facts are undeniable; but they are depressing, and represent only the dark side. There is no glad recognition of the glorious outcome of all the ills of life. Ecclesiastes has its place in the canon of Holy Scripture. It puts more vividly than in any other way the vanities of life. Thus prepares the heart to accept of God's way of happiness,—a blameless, trustful, pious life.

the College of St. Jacques in Paris, and took the degree of licentiatus theologiae. In 1303 he was appointed provincial of his order for Saxony, and in 1307 vicar-general for Bohemia. In 1306 he again taught in Paris, and in 1316 he settled at Strassburg as vicar for the grand-master of his order. There he became acquainted with the Brethren of the Free Spirit; and when, some time after, he was removed to France as prior of the Dominican monastery, the extraordinary character of his preaching aroused suspicion, and he was accused, before the grand-master Hervé (at that moment present at Metz), of entertaining connections with suspicious persons. An investigation was instituted, and Eckart was acquitted. Archbishop Henry of Cologne, however, the implacable enemy of the Beeghards, had formed an opinion of his own about Eckart; and in 1325 very heavy accusations against him were laid before the chapter of the order assembled in Venice. Nicholas of Strassburg, as papal nuncio, was charged with the investigation; and, as he himself belonged to the mystical school of theology, he found nothing to blame in Eckart. But Henry would not suffer himself to be robbed of his prey in this way. He accused both Eckart and his protector, Nicholas, of heresy; and a regular process was instituted before an episcopal court of inquisition. Both Eckart and Nicholas protested against the competency of the court, and appealed to the Pope; but they were, nevertheless, both of them condemned. On Feb. 13, 1329, Eckart read from the pulpit of the cloister-chapel in Cologne a solemn declaration, in which he protested his willingness to recant any error into which he might have fallen. Immediately after, he set out for Avignon; but when the papal decision was given, in the bull of March 27, 1329, he had died. The bull, however, treated the case with great leniency. On account of the declaration he had made at Cologne, Eckart was evidently considered as one who, before death, had returned to the bosom of the Church. The bull condemned seventeen propositions of his, and pointed out eleven more as suspicious. But, in spite of the condemnation, his pupils still clung to him with great reverence and love. When Heinrich Suso wrote his autobiography, in 1300, he spoke of Eckart as the “holy master;” and his sermons were frequently copied in the monasteries of Germany, Switzerland, Tyrol, and Bohemia. In 1430 the papal condemnation was repeated; but in 1440 Nicholas of Cusa, nevertheless, mentions Eckart’s works as one of the sources of his system. A collected edition of his works was given by Franz Pfeiffer, Leipzig, 1887.

What starts the reader in Eckart’s writings is his strongly pronounced though mystic pantheism, often expressed with singular power. God is not the highest being, he says, for he is the only being. Outside of God there is nothing but illusion and deception. In its true existence every creature is not only a revelation of God, but a part of him; and—here enters the easy transition from mystics to ascetics—the true object of human life must consequently be to strip it of all illusions and deceptions, and return into the one great being, God.
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PAUL TECKACKERT.

EDEN (Heb. 137; LXX. 137; Ezech. 137; Schmieden).—The land or region in which "the Lord God planted a garden," where "he put the man whom he had formed" (Gen. ii. 8). The Hebrew word (137) denotes a "land of delight" (LXX. μητρίας; Vulg. voluptatis). The Hebrews themselves may have so understood it; but the real origin of the name is more probably to be found in the Assyrian ṭūni (from Accadian ātin), "plain."

Description of the Garden of Eden.—Eden and the garden are so closely related in the Old Testament and in Christian thought, that it is necessary to treat of them together. Although in Gen. ii. 8, 10 they are not identical, and "the garden" is repeatedly mentioned alone in chapters iii. ii., while in iv. 16 Eden is so mentioned, with apparent reference to the land or region, yet the expression ῥηθὸς ἁλαθεντικος ("garden of Eden") occurs Gen. ii. ii. iii., 23, 24; Joel iii. 3; Ezek. xxxvi. 35; and in the following passages Eden alone seems to be used in the same sense: Ezek. xxviii. 13, xxi. 9, 18, 18; Isa. li. 3. We find also the expression "garden of God," ἡ ἐδένα ἡ ἀρχαίαν ἡσυχίαν; Ezek. xxviii. 13, xxi. 8 (twice), 9, and "garden of Jehovah," ἡ ἐδένα ἡ ἀρχαίαν ἡσυχίαν (Gen. xiii. 10, Isa. li. 3), and, with kindred meaning, "mountain of God," ἡ ἐδένα ἡ ἀρχαίαν ἡσυχίαν (Isa. xi. 9, lxv. 25, Ezek. xxviii. 14, 16).

The LXX. generally translate ἡ ἐδένα by ἐναποκλήμα (see above), in Gen. ii. 8, 10, iv. 16, by ἐναποκλήμα, and in Isa. li. 3 by ὑπακούων. This latter word (from παιδεύειν) is generally employed by the LXX. for ἡ ἐδένα (Ezek. xxxvi. 35, σημείως; and the Vulgate in most cases follows their example.

Eden and the garden were situated "toward the east," i.e., eastward from the writer (Gen. ii. 8). The vegetation was luxurious (ii. 9): among other fruit-trees were found the fig-tree (iii. 7), and two trees beside, which are repeatedly named, but not minutely described, "the tree of life," and "the tree of knowledge of good and evil." Irrigation was secured by a river flowing into the garden from Eden: where its sources were we are not distinctly told. On leaving the garden it divided into four "heads," or branches; and the course of each is indicated, except in the case of the fourth, which was too well known to need it. Besides its abundant fertility, the garden was also the home of all kinds of animals, including cattle, beasts of the field, and birds (ii. 19, 20).

Into this garden man was put "to dress it and to keep it" (ii. 15); i.e., to cultivate and guard it. Here he gave names to all the animals (ii. 20); here the woman was fashioned out of his rib (ii. 21, 22); here the two lived unclothed and innocent (ii. 25), accustomed to intercourse with God (ii. 19, 22, cf. iii. 8), with only one restrictive command to observe,—the prohibition to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (ii. 17). Through the specious words of the serpent (iii. 1-5) the woman was led to dis...
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obey the command, and the man followed her example (iii. 9). Thus they lost their innocence; and the Lord passed sentence upon them, and cursed the serpent. He provided tunics of skins (iii. 21) to take the place of the aprons of fig-leaves which the man and his wife in their shame had made (iii. 7), and then sent them out of the garden, that, with their newly-gained knowledge of good and evil, they might not eat of the tree of life any more forever (iii. 22, 23). On the east of the garden the Lord placed the "cherubim, and the flaming sword, self-brandish ing, to guard the way to the tree of life" (iii. 24).

(See ADAM, CHERUBIM, CREATION, EVE, SER PENT, SIN.)

The conception of an early home of man, where innocence and happiness reigned, and there was habitual intercourse with divine beings, is found, with some striking similarities to the account in Genesis, in the mythologies of other peoples, notably those of India and Persia. According to the former, Mêra, the "mountain of the gods," situated in the north, gives rise to the spring Gâmpâ, which waters the "land of joy," on the summit, and then forms four lakes, whence issue four rivers that flow through four regions, and empty into four seas. On the northern side of Mêra was Utíra-Kuru, a kind of paradise, in which Manu Vâivasata lived before the flood.

According to the Persian myths, the sacred mountain Hárâ-Berezaiti, from which flow twenty rivers, overshadows the happy land, Airjâna-Voedja, where Yima dwelt in the time of his purity.

Such details as the tree, the serpent, and the loss of paradise through sin, also re-appear in these mythologies. The first two are found also in that of Babylonia; and here the conception of the cherubim appears under the form of the winged bull, called generally lamaru and nádu, and by other names, but also Kîrîâ = šîrû (derivation probably from kardû, "to be mighty, majestic"). The exact belief of the Babylonians as to the primitive condition and surroundings of man is not yet known.

But, whatever the general or even detailed resemblance between the biblical account and those in heathen mythologies, the differences are still more marked. The former is unique in its simplicity, dignity, lofty conception of God and of man, and in its distinct idea of sin as a voluntary and responsible violation of God's command, entailing the gravest moral consequences. And, while the Old Testament writers looked back to the garden of Eden as the ideal of that which was lovely and desirable (Gen. xiii. 10; Joel ii. 18; Is. ii. 3; Ezek. xxviii. 8 sqq., xxx. 16, 18, xxxvi. 35; cf. Prov. iii. 18, xi. 30, xiii. 12, xv. 4), it became to the prophets a standard to measure the coming blessedness of the Messianic age (Is. li. 12; Ezek. xxx. 27); and the conception of that happy time was more or less shaped by the recollection of what had been (Is. vi. 6-9, xv. 26; Ezek. xlii. 1 sqq.). Later Jewish thought (as seen especially in the Book of Enoch) developed the notion of the future abode of the chosen, and in the New Testament there appeared the clear belief in the Christian paradise. (See PARADISE.)

Location of Eden. — The writer evidently de-
geographical knowledge, and wide disagreement still prevails. There are said to have been in all some eighty hypotheses as to the position of Eden. This number, however, includes the eccentric proposals to find it in Prussia on the shores of the Baltic (Easss), or in the Canary Islands (Credner), and others of like character. All the views which deserve notice here may be grouped under three heads:—

I. THEORIES WHICH PLACE EDEN IN THE FAR EAST.— This class of views is sometimes called "traditional," because it can be traced back to Josephus, and has been thought to rest on genuine tradition. It identifies the Pison with the Indus or the Ganges, and Havilah with India or, vaguely, with the Eastern region. Cush is then commonly the country south of Egypt, or, in general, the south land of Asia and Africa (see Cusan), and Gihon is the Nile; or, else Cush is derived from the supposed Caspian people, Kosovato; and Gihon is the Oxus, called by Islamites Gauihanu. (When Pison is made identical with Indus, then Gihon has sometimes been explained as Ganges.) It is then sometimes supposed that an eastern river which cannot be found on the map has been inserted in place of two other Eastern rivers. This general theory has been held, in some form of it, by Josephus, most church fathers, and, among modern writers, Ewald, Renan, Maspero, Berthau, Dillmann, Rietzsch, etc. In support of this view such grounds as the following have been adduced: (a) The language of Gen. ii. 8, iv. 16, ii. 2, as well as modern research, point to the far East as the early home of man. (b) The Indian conception of Meru suggests that the biblical account rests on recollections from that region. (c) Gold and gems are products of India. (d) Havilah (being, perhaps, originally an appellative from מיר , "sand," hence "the sandy," or "sand-land") can be applied to India as a country of which the Hebrews had only dim knowledge: it denoted in their history a land south and south-east of Palestine; to extend it vaguely eastward was easy. (e) Gihon ( = Nile, called Πόσιος, LXX. (Jer. ii. 18) for Hebrew נב, =Oxus) may be regarded as the reappearance of an Asiatic river, or as flowing out of the same earth-embracing Okeanos from which the Pison, Tigris, and Euphrates came. Gihon = Oxus is of course relieved from all such difficulty. It is replied to these arguments, (a) The language of Gen. xi. 2 only shows that after the flood men came from the East; and although the legends of other peoples identify the original home of man with the resting-place after the flood (see Lenormant, Ararat and Eden, Contemp. Roc., September, 1881), there is no evidence that the Hebrews did the same. Gen. iv. 18, however, says nothing of the location of Eden, but only of the land of Nod; and Gen. ii. 8 need not mean more than that Eden was eastward from the writer of the account, or from those for whom he wrote. But the hypothesis of the cradle of the human race is not yet so definite as to warrant the theory. (b) The assumption that the form of an Aryan tradition is a sure key to Semitic traditions is groundless. (c) Gold and gems are indeed found in India, but not only there. (d) Havilah was a land known to the Hebrews (see Cusan); and, whether India was so or not, the Hebrews must have been aware that Havilah did not extend across Tigris and Euphrates, and off into the distant south-east. (e) The "river" of Gen. ii. 10, which "went forth from Eden," can have nothing to do with Okeanos; and there is no proof that the notice of a river which disappeared in one continent, and reappeared in another, existed among the Hebrews. As to the identification of Gihon with Oxus: the Arabic Gauihanu is an appellative, and can be applied to any rushing river (e.g., Araxes, Gauihanu er Ras); and the Kosovato did not live east of the Caspian Sea, but, as is clear from the cuneiform inscriptions, in the mountain-region south-west from the Lake of Oroumiah, and thence eastward toward the borders of Elam and Media.

II. THEORIES WHICH FIND EDEN IN ARMENIA.—These take as the starting-point the known sources of the Tigris and Euphrates, and seek two other rivers rising in the same region. Thus, Pison = Phasis, Havilah = Colchis (or Pison = Kur, Cyrus), Gihon = Araxes, Cush = Kosovato. Representatives of this class of views are Reland, Calmet, Lecerle, Keil, etc. But, if the Kosovato, the eastern shore of the Caspian, neither can they on its western shore; and although some might be tempted to make use of the name of the country Kau, or Kusua, which appears on a Cappadocian tablet (Proceedings Soc. Bib. Arch., November and December 1881), still it is not easy to see how this could be connected with an Armenian river. The other proposed identifications are still more precarious. Further: by no possibility could these four rivers be supposed to be branches of one parent-stream. When it is claimed that nakhur can mean "river-system," this is not borne out by the usage of the language (see above); and the hypothesis (Luther and others) that the flood altered the physical features of Asia, so that the courses of streams are now different from the original courses, is unsupported by any thing in the biblical account of the flood, from being hinted at by the writer of Gen. ii. that he evidently expects, in his description, to be understood by his contemporaries as referring to a region still accessible to men, and recognizable by them.

III. THEORIES WHICH PLACE EDEN IN BARTY-LONIA.—Advocates of this location had their attention fixed by the fact that the Euphrates and the Tigris are actually united for a certain distance in the Satt el-Arab, which then empties into the Persian Gulf by two or more mouths. The Satt el-Arab was therefore regarded as the "river" of Gen. ii. 10: the Euphrates and Tigris were looked upon as its branches, reckoning up the stream; and the Pison and Gihon were identified with the two main arms through which the Satt el-Arab empties. Calvin, who held this view, considered the Pison to be the eastern arm, and the Gihon the western. Scaliger and others followed him; while as to the writer of the Hexateuch, etc., found Pison in the western, Gihon in the eastern arm. A modification of this view is given by Pressel (Herzog's Real-Encycl., ed. i., vol. XX., art. Paradisus), to the effect, that, instead of being these outlets of the Satt el-Arab, Pison and Gihon are two tributary streams flowing in from the east. This form of the theory is more consistent.
than the other, since it seeks all four branches in the same general direction,—up the stream; but the words of Gen. ii. oblige us to seek them all in the opposite direction,—down the stream. Only in the direction of its current could the river, on leaving the garden, divide into four branches. Against these theories it is further urged that we have ample grounds, from classical history and from the cuneiform inscriptions, as well as from the nature of the soil and the present rate of physical change in that region, to believe that the sea once extended a hundred miles or more beyond its present limits to the north, thus covering the supposed site of Eden, and that the Euphrates and Tigris emptied into it without uniting (Pliny: Nat. Hist., VI., § 31; Ritter: Erdkunde, X. 3; Kiepert: Allte Geog., p. 138).

Another view has been proposed, and advocated with great force and skill. It finds Eden in Northern Babylon, immediately about the site of Babylon (Friedr. Delitzsch, Wo lag das Paradies?). Where the Euphrates and Tigris approached nearest to each other, the country was intersected by very numerous water-courses, whose current was always from the Euphrates toward the Tigris, on account of difference of level (Arrian: Exp. Alex., VII. 7, contr. Xen. Anab., I. 7, 10). The effect was that of an extremely great irrigating stream, diverging more widely from each other, they resumed their independent course; and from the former there proceeded two important streams, partly natural, perhaps partly artificial, like the water-courses named above; the Sa't (or Nwu) on the east, and the Sa'llakopas (=Pison) on the west. The Sa'll Nwu was known as an important navigable stream or Guyfin d6 (Cun. Inscr. of Western Asia, II. 83), and, as late as when the Arabs overrun Babylonia, it is repeatedly referred to in the Arabic inscriptions, and is named by the Arab geographers. On leaving the garden, divide into four branches. The situation of Eden is claimed to satisfy the requirements of Gen. ii. 10, and to be precisely the way in which an Oriental would conceive of irrigation,—the express object of the "river." As the Euphrates and Tigris, which have thus formed in effect only the outside limits of this great irrigating stream, diverge more widely from each other, they resumed their independent course; and from the former there proceeded two important streams, partly natural, perhaps partly artificial, like the water-courses named above; the Sa'll Nwu on the east, and the Sa'llakopas (= Pison) on the west. The Sa'll Nwu was known as an important navigable stream or Guyfin d6 (Cun. Inscr. of Western Asia, II. 83), and, as late as when the Arabs overrun Babylonia, it is repeatedly referred to in the Arabic inscriptions, and is named by the Arab geographers. On leaving the garden, divide into four branches. The situation of Eden is claimed to satisfy the requirements of Gen. ii. 10, and to be precisely the way in which an Oriental would conceive of irrigation,—the express object of the "river." As the Euphrates and Tigris, which have thus formed in effect only the outside limits of this great irrigating stream, diverge more widely from each other, they resumed their independent course; and from the former there proceeded two important streams, partly natural, perhaps partly artificial, like the water-courses named above; the Sa'll Nwu on the east, and the Sa'llakopas (= Pison) on the west. The Sa'll Nwu was known as an important navigable stream or Guyfin d6 (Cun. Inscr. of Western Asia, II. 83), and, as late as when the Arabs overrun Babylonia, it is repeatedly referred to in the Arabic inscriptions, and is named by the Arab geographers. On leaving the garden, divide into four branches. The situation of Eden is claimed to satisfy the requirements of Gen. ii. 10, and to be precisely the way in which an Oriental would conceive of irrigation,—the express object of the "river." As the Euphrates and Tigris, which have thus formed in effect only the outside limits of this great irrigating stream, diverge more widely from each other, they resumed their independent course; and from the former there proceeded two important streams, partly natural, perhaps partly artificial, like the water-courses named above; the Sa'll Nwu on the east, and the Sa'llakopas (= Pison) on the west. The Sa'll Nwu was known as an important navigable stream or Guyfin d6 (Cun. Inscr. of Western Asia, II. 83), and, as late as when the Arabs overrun Babylonia, it is repeatedly referred to in the Arabic inscriptions, and is named by the Arab geographers. On leaving the garden, divide into four branches. The situation of Eden is claimed to satisfy the requirements of Gen. ii. 10, and to be precisely the way in which an Oriental would conceive of irrigation,—the express object of the "river." As the Euphrates and Tigris, which have thus formed in effect only the outside limits of this great irrigating stream, diverge more widely from each other, they resumed their independent course; and from the former there proceeded two important streams, partly natural, perhaps partly artificial, like the water-courses named above; the Sa'll Nwu on the east, and the Sa'llakopas (= Pison) on the west. The Sa'll Nwu was known as an important navigable stream or Guyfin d6 (Cun. Inscr. of Western Asia, II. 83), and, as late as when the Arabs overrun Babylonia, it is repeatedly referred to in the Arabic inscriptions, and is named by the Arab geographers. On leaving the garden, divide into four branches. The situation of Eden is claimed to satisfy the requirements of Gen. ii. 10, and to be precisely the way in which an Oriental would conceive of irrigation,—the express object of the "river." As the Euphrates and Tigris, which have thus formed in effect only the outside limits of this great irrigating stream, diverge more widely from each other, they resumed their independent course; and from the former there proceeded two important streams, partly natural, perhaps partly artificial, like the water-courses named above; the Sa'll Nwu on the east, and the Sa'llakopas (= Pison) on the west. The Sa'll Nwu was known as an important navigable stream or Guyfin d6 (Cun. Inscr. of Western Asia, II. 83), and, as late as when the Arabs overrun Babylonia, it is repeatedly referred to in the Arabic inscriptions, and is named by the Arab geographers. On leaving the garden, divide into four branches. The situation of Eden is claimed to satisfy the requirements of Gen. ii. 10, and to be precisely the way in which an Oriental would conceive of irrigation,—the express object of the "river." As the Euphrates and Tigris, which have thus formed in effect only the outside limits of this great irrigating stream, diverge more widely from each other, they resumed their independent course; and from the former there proceeded two important streams, partly natural, perhaps partly artificial, like the water-courses named above; the Sa'll Nwu on the east, and the Sa'llakopas (= Pison) on the west. The Sa'll Nwu was known as an important navigable stream or Guyfin d6 (Cun. Inscr. of Western Asia, II. 83), and, as late as when the Arabs overrun Babylonia, it is repeatedly referred to in the Arabic inscriptions, and is named by the Arab geographers. On leaving the garden, divide into four branches. The situation of Eden is claimed to satisfy the requirements of Gen. ii. 10, and to be precisely the way in which an Oriental would conceive of irrigation,—the express object of the "river." As the Euphrates and Tigris, which have thus formed in effect only the outside limits of this great irrigating stream, diverge more widely from each other, they resumed their independent course; and from the former there proceeded two important streams, partly natural, perhaps partly artificial, like the water-courses named above; the Sa'll Nwu on the east, and the Sa'llakopas (= Pison) on the west. The Sa'll Nwu was known as an important navigable stream or Guyfin d6 (Cun. Inscr. of Western Asia, II. 83), and, as late as when the Arabs overrun Babylonia, it is repeatedly referred to in the Arabic inscriptions, and is named by the Arab geographers. On leaving the garden, divide into four branches. The situation of Eden is claimed to satisfy the requirements of Gen. ii. 10, and to be precisely the way in which an Oriental would conceive of irrigation,—the express object of the "river." As the Euphrates and Tigris, which have thus formed in effect only the outside limits of this great irrigating stream, diverge more widely from each other, they resumed their independent course; and from the former there proceeded two important streams, partly natural, perhaps partly artificial, like the water-courses named above; the Sa'll Nwu on the east, and the Sa'llakopas (= Pison) on the west. The Sa'll Nwu was known as an important navigable stream or Guyfin d6 (Cun. Inscr. of Western Asia, II. 83), and, as late as when the Arabs overrun Babylonia, it is repeatedly referred to in the Arabic inscriptions, and is named by the Arab geographers. On leaving the garden, divide into four branches. The situation of Eden is claimed to satisfy the requirements of Gen. ii. 10, and to be precisely the way in which an Oriental would conceive of irrigation,—the express object of the "river." As the Euphrates and Tigris, which have thus formed in effect only the outside limits of this great irrigating stream, diverge more widely from each other, they resumed their independent course; and from the former there proceeded two important streams, partly natural, perhaps partly artificial, like the water-courses named above; the Sa'll Nwu on the east, and the Sa'llakopas (= Pison) on the west. The Sa'll Nwu was known as an important navigable stream or Guyfin d6 (Cun. Inscr. of Western Asia, II. 83), and, as late as when the Arabs overrun Babylonia, it is repeatedly referred to in the Arabic inscriptions, and is named by the Arab geographers. On leaving the garden, divide into four branches. The situation of Eden is claimed to satisfy the requirements of Gen. ii. 10, and to be precisely the way in which an Oriental would conceive of irrigation,—the express object of the "river." As the Euphrates and Tigris, which have thus formed in effect only the outside limits of this great irrigating stream, diverge more widely from each other, they resumed their independent course; and from the former there proceeded two important streams, partly natural, perhaps partly artificial, like the water-courses named above; the Sa'll Nwu on the east, and the Sa'llakopas (= Pison) on the west. The Sa'll Nwu was known as an important navigable stream or Guyfin d6 (Cun. Inscr. of Western Asia, II. 83), and, as late as when the Arabs overrun Babylonia, it is repeatedly referred to in the Arabic inscriptions, and is named by the Arab geographers. On leaving the garden, divide into four branches. The situation of Eden is claimed to satisfy the requirements of Gen. ii. 10, and to be precisely the way in which an Oriental would conceive of irrigation,—the express object of the "river." As the Euphrates and Tigris, which have thus formed in effect only the outside limits of this great irr...
Whether the Beth-Eden of Amos i. 5 (ield; A.V., "house of Eden") is the same people, is still a matter of question. This is at any rate more likely than its identification with 'Ehden on Lebanon, Bejt Djenn at the foot of Hermon, or Djuissueh el-Kadmeh, south-east from Laodicea, the Parthia of Ptolemy. The fact that it is named in connection with the Persian empire does not necessarily disprove its identity with the Mesopotamian Eden; for the intention of the prophet might be to extend his threatening to the Aramaic tribes generally.

At all events, the Hebrew pointing of ה in these passages shows a correct apprehension that these Edens were distinct from the Eden (ャ) of Genesis. (See Fr. Delitzsch: Wo lag das Paradies? Leipzig, 1881; R. Smend: Der Prophet Eschek, Leipzig, 1880; E. Schrader: Die Keitschriften und die Geschichtsforschung, Giessen, 1878.)

EDESSA, a city of Northern Mesopotamia (the Assyrians, Edessa, the Syrians Urkoi, the Arabs er-Rodâ, the present Orfa or Urfa), is situated on the Daisun, a tributary to the Euphrates, fifty-five miles west of Diabekir, and is estimated to have a population of from twenty-five thousand to fifty thousand. It seems to be a very old city. One tradition identifies it with Erech, one of the principal cities of the Babylonian Empire; another, with the Ur of the Chaldeans. But nothing is known with certainty of its history until after the Macedonian conquest of Persia. A Greco-Macedonian colony was settled in the city and its neighborhood; and in 136 B.C. Urhoe, or Osrhoës, founded an independent kingdom there, Osrhoene, which lasted till 217 A.D., when Caracalla made the country a Roman province. In 637 the city was conquered by the Arabs; but in 1097 Count Baldwin of Flanders succeeded in establishing once more an independent empire there, which for fifty years formed a bulwark for the kingdom of Jerusalem. It was conquered in 1146 by Noelreddin, and the city is now a Turkish possession. Christianity was early introduced in Edessa; though the legend about the correspondence between Christ and King Abgarus appears to have no historical foundation. In the third century the city became the seat of a bishop, and in the fourth the wealth and splendor of its churches and monasteries was such as to tempt the apostolic of Julian. In the fourth century it all became the principal seat of Syrian learning. Ephrem Syrus resided there, and was the founder of the Edessene school of theology. At the same time the Persian school flourished in the city. After the death of Ephrem, however, his school fell into the hands of the Arians, just as, later on, the Persian school became the stronghold of Nestorianism. After the Mohammedan conquest, all the Christian churches were transformed into mosques. The city is still the seat of a Greek archbishop and an Armenian bishop.


EDICT (1) is an order issued by a ruler, either of command or prohibition. It is well in church history to the orders of the Roman emperors relating to Christianity. From Trajan to Constantine these edicts had instituted persecution. But Constantine issued three which forbade meddling with Christians on the part of the authorities. Several religious edicts of previous Roman emperors are extant; but they are altogether too favorable to Christianity, grave doubt is thrown upon their genuineness. The distinction between an edict and a rescript is that the latter is issued in answer to an inquiry. See PERSECUTIONS, and KAIM, Rom und d. Christentum, Berlin, 1881. (2) Edict is the technical name for a formal invitation given by presbyteries in Scotland to all who know any thing against the character of a pastor-elect to come forward and testify.

EDICT OF NANTES. See HUGUENOTS, NANTES.

EDICT OF WORMS. See LUTHER, WORMS.

EDIFICATION, a New-Testament designation, comparing the Church and the Christian believer to a house or temple (1 Cor. iii. 9; Eph. ii. 21). Christian character is an edifice built on Christ (Eph. ii. 20; Col. ii. 17) and enlarged by the Word (Acts xiii. 32). Christian intercourse (1 Thess. v. 11) and all the other means of grace. The Holy Ghost himself dwells in the believer regarded as a temple (1 Cor. vi. 19); and the constant invitation is, that it should be kept holy, and thus be a fit sanctuary of God (1 Cor. iii. 17).

EDMUND (1) and (2). See EADMUND.

E'DOM, E'Domite, IDUMÆ'A, IDUMÆ'AN.

[Esau (א"וא), the twin-brother of Jacob, was the son of Isaac and Rebekah, and was so called because he was "hairy" (Gen. xxv. 25). He was subsequently named Edom (א"וז), "red"), because he said to Jacob, "Feed me with that same red," meaning lentils (xxx. 30). The traits of their ancestor re-appear in the Edomites; for, like Esau, they were wild hunters, and of low spiritual tone.]

The Land of the Edomites was called Seir (א"וז, "rugged"). The original inhabitants were the Horites (ד"ו "dwellers in caves"), or troglodytes. The Edomites, who possessed them, are sometimes called "children of Seir" (2 Chron. xxv. 11, 14). The country lay south of the Dead Sea, and east of the Arabah (Josh. xv. 1; Judg. v. 4); although in a wider sense the same name is given to a stretch to the east of the Arabah (Deut. ii. 1). Poetically the country was the "Mount of Esau" (Obad. 8, 9, 19, 21). From the "Mount of Judah" it was separated by the wildness of Zin (Josh. xv. 1). Bozrah (now Buseirah) was, at all events, at times, its capital (Isa. xxxiv. 6). Along its coast cities were Sela (Petra), in a narrow wady off the Arabah (2 Kings xiv. 7; Isa. xvi. 1); Ma'on (now Mu'an) (Judg. x. 12); Elath, or Ethol, and Ezion-geber, the important harbors at the northern end of the Red Sea (Deut. ii. 8; 2 Chron. vii. 17). The borders of the country varied, especially to the west and east, as: the more fortunate fell. The country is mountainous; but the soil in the glens and on the mountain-terraces bears a luxuriant growth of plant and vegetable life,
EDOM.

...upon which in the spring-time the traveller feasts
his eyes.

The People and their History.—There were kings
in the land of Edom before there reigned any kings in Ammon. Antiqu., XIII. 9, 1, XV. 7, 9; but Antipater, the son of the governor of Idumea, having gained Julius Caesar's favor, was by him appointed Procurator of Judea (47 B.C.). His son was Herod the Great, whom the Roman senate appointed (40 B.C.) King of Judea (Joseph., Antiq., XIII. 1, 15, xii. 16 sqq.).

...of the two peoples rule. Petra gave at a later period the name district than the old Edom. Into the landsthey...
and other places; but such training was given to few, and, besides, was technical, consisting of homiletics and music.

During the captivity the synagogue system of worship was developed; and as a consequence, a higher grade of intelligence in religious and educational matters characterized the national life. On the return, the disuse of Hebrew as a vernacular rendered instruction in it imperative, if the people at large were to understand their own sacred books. Contact with great nations like the Babylonian, the Greek, and the Roman, enlarged the Hebrew mind. Other things than religion claimed attention. Jerusalem became the seat of a university, and in strange contrast to former exclusiveness there was generous appreciation of heathen culture. In the towns and villages education was not carried so far. Reading and writing, the law, and the tenets of the Jewish faith, were probably the only topics taught. "At five years a child should study the Bible, at ten the Mishna, and at fifteen the Talmud." A graphic description of the school in Nazareth in our Lord's day is given by an anonymous writer in these words: [The schoolroom is] "the interior of a squat building rudely constructed of stone, with a domed roof, and whitewashed walls, a wooden desk or cupboard on one side, and an inscription in Hebrew over the door. From the building, as we approach, comes the hum of many children's voices, repeating the verses of the sacred Torah [the law] in unthinking and perfunctory monotone. The aged teacher sits silent in the midst. As we look in, we see his huge turban, his gray beard, and solemn features, appearing over the ruddy faces of the dark-eyed boys who sit on the floor around him. The long row of tiny red slippers extends along the wall near the door. The earthen water-bottle stands on the mat beside the Khazzan, or synagogue teacher. The scholars are the children of the richer members of the village community; of the Betlanim, or 'men of leisure,' who form the representative congregation of the village. The 'standing men,' who go up yearly with the village priest for a week in Jerusalem, to fulfill similar functions in the temple ritual" (Rabbi Jeshua, Lond. and N.Y., 1881, pp. 23, 24).

Thus, even then, education was limited, and there was much ignorance; so that the phrase "country people" was synonymous with the "illiterate." Of these the contemptuous remark was made by the Sanhedrin, "This multitude which knoweth not the law are accursed" (John vii. 49). Very probably this ignorance was principal among the lowest class, the lineal descendants of the primitive settlers of Palestine, whose children are the wretched felahkin of to-day. According to Philo (On the Virtuous being also Free, Bohn's trans., vol. iii. 500) Josephus (Contra Apion, i. 12), and the Talmud, the pious Jews took great pains with their children's education. "Jewish parents and teachers carefully aimed at the education of children was neglected." "The world is preserved by the breath of the children in the schools." So said the rabbins. The later Jews were taught a trade in their schools, and thus could earn their own living. That Saul of Tarsus, the learned pupil of the great rabbin Gama-
EDUCATION.

In order that the church may be furnished with a sufficient number of ministers and other persons fit to govern them, and preach the word of God unto them, they shall be advised to choose those scholars who are already well advanced in good learning, and of most promising and hopeful parts, and to maintain such in the universities, that they may be fitted and prepared for the work of the ministry. Kings, princes, and the nobility shall be petitioned and exhorted particularly to mind this important affair, and to lay by some part of their revenues towards their maintenance; and the richer churches shall do the like. Colloquies (i.e., presbyteries) shall, as they see meet, take the best measures in the premises that matters of so great necessity may be successful. If single churches have not means, their neighbors shall join them, so that one poor scholar at least may be maintained in every colloquy. And, in order that this design shall not fail, every fifth penny of the revenues of which the ministers shall have convenient done, to be employed in this service.” A like policy was general throughout the Reformed bodies of France.

In 1641 the General Assembly of the Scotch Church recommended that every presbytery consisting of twelve ministers should maintain one bursar, and, when the number was fewer than twelve, they should be joined to another presbytery. Four years later, the minimum of aid ordered to be given was put at a hundred pounds Scots yearly. Shortly after the session of the Westminster Assembly, a society for securing and aiding candidates of the ministry was organized by leading divines and laymen, several of whom were members of that assembly; and among these were such men as Baxter, Bates, Poole, Stillingfleet, and Cudworth. This movement, however, came to an end soon after the Restoration. The Church of England attained the same result by scholarship endowments at her universities.

In the United States of America the scarcity of ministers, and the exigencies of an extending population, constrained the leading ecclesiastical bodies and prominent ministers in the church early to adopt vigorous measures for meeting the demand thus created. Colleges were founded at Cambridge (1638) and New Haven (1700) and in New Jersey (1748), where education was freely granted to young men contemplating the ministry who were unable to defray their own expenses. In 1751 the synod of New York “recommende[d] an annual collection from all its churches for the support of young students whose circumstances render them incapable of maintaining themselves at learning.” Funds also were obtained from England and Scotland and Ireland for this same cause, but with special reference to the supply of the ministry. In 1770 the combined synods of New York and Philadelphia approved and recommended a plan proposed by the president of New Castle “for the assistance of candidates for the ministry by assessments in proportion to the number of ministers and on vacant congregations, as well as by voluntary annual subscription.” Thus, and other initiatory measures culminated in the organization of a “board of education” by the General Assembly in 1819. This board, with various modifications of rules and measures, has continued until this time. At present (1881) the maximum appropriation for a student, when the funds allow it, is a hundred and fifty dollars for students in college and theological seminary. Besides the aid thus given, there are scholarships attached to her institutions, of which worthy students may avail themselves. Full three-fourths of her ministry have thus been more or less helped into sacred orders.

There is also a board of education in Presbyterian churches (South), conducted on the same principles.

In the Episcopal Church the education work is left to the several dioceses, some of which have small societies collecting each a few hundred dollars per year. It has, besides, two general societies representing the two prominent schools of thought in the Church; viz., the Society for the Increase of the Ministry (organized 1857, and having its office in New York, mainly High Church in its tendencies, which has helped to ordination (first when it may conveniently be done, to be employed in this service.” A like policy was general throughout the Reformed bodies of France.

In 1873 this society was united under one administration with the college society, and has its office in Boston. The annual contributions from the Church, it has fifty-four endowed scholarships, the revenues of which go to aid students. The whole number of students aided by it up to the year 1880 is 6,724.

The Baptists have no general education society; but, instead, they have a number of limited organizations scattered throughout the States. Of these there are at present nine. The amount of aid granted by these varies according to the need of the students; some receiving per year between two hundred and fifty and three hundred dollars.

The Board of Education of the Methodist-Episcopal Church was organized in 1869, and has several auxiliary societies established in different parts of the Union. Its scope is broader than most of the other kindred organizations; as it contemplates aiding, not only individual students, but also literary and theological institutions, both at home and abroad. The grants made to students are chiefly in the form of loans, to be paid back at the earliest opportunity.

The Reformed Church (lately Dutch), the Lutheran Church, the German-Reformed Church, and indeed nearly all other Christian bodies, operate on the same principle to secure a ministry among themselves suited to their congregations, and command public respect. And we
must add, that it is to the wise and liberal policy thus pursued the fact is largely due that the ministry of Protestant Christendom throughout the world has attained its present high repute, not only for sound moral and religious character, but also for broad intelligence and extensive knowledge.

EDWARDS, Bela Bates, D.D., was b. in South-ampton, Mass., July 4, 1802; graduated at Amherst College in 1824, at Andover Theological Seminary in 1830. In the two years 1828-29 he was a tutor in Amherst College, and in the five years 1828-33 he was assistant secretary of the American Education Society. In 1837 he was ordained as a minister of the gospel, and was also appointed professor of the Hebrew language in Andover Theological Seminary. Professor Moses Stuart having resigned his office in 1848, Professor Edwards was elected as his successor. In this professorship he edited the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures with great accuracy and success. He was an enthusiast in sacred philology. He injured his constitution by unremitting toil. In 1846, in consequence of enfeebled health, he made an extended tour in Europe, visiting England, France, Germany, and Italy. In 1851 he was again compelled to absent himself from Andover, and spend the winter in the South. He died at Athens, Ga., April 20, 1852 when he was nearly fifty years of age. He was distinguished not only as a skilful instructor, but also as a wise counsellor. He united soundness of judgment with rare delicacy of taste and poetic sensibility. Without grace of eloquence, he was an eloquent preacher. The tenderness of his sensibilities, and the earnestness of his piety, were indicated in his countenance and tones of voice, as well as in his pure and classical language. He originated and planned man philanthropic institutions, among others, that which has resulted to the missionary Gazetteer. The former of these institutions, among others, was the Biblical Repository, which, during the four preceding years, had been edited by Professor Robinson at Andover. In 1844, in conjunction with E. A. Park, he established the Bibliotheca Sacra on its present plan. Of this periodical he remained editor-in-chief until 1852. Mainly through his influence The Biblical Repository, then published in New York, was united with the Bibliotheca Sacra in 1851. For twenty-three years he was employed in superintending periodical literature, and, with the assistance of several of his friends, left thirty-one octavo volumes as the monuments of his enterprise and industry. As an early and active friend of two important academies and of Amherst College, which he served as a trustee, as a director of the American Education Society, and a zealous member of other philanthropic institutions, he performed a vast amount of labor, the results of which will long remain. Some of his discourses and essays were published in Boston in 1853, in two duodecimo volumes. The first volume contains a Memoir in 370 pages by the editor.

EDWARDS, John, D.D., b. at Hartford, Feb. 26, 1837; d. at Cambridge, April 10, 1718. He was "a zealous Calvinist, and a most voluminous writer." His principal works were, Discourse concerning the authority, stile and perfection of the books of the Old and New Testament, London, 1693, 3 vols.; A complete history, or survey, of all the dispensations and methods of religion from the beginning of the world to the consummation of all things, as represented in the Old and New Testament. London, 1699, 2 vols.; The preacher, London, 1705-1709, 3 vols.: Theologia reformata, London, 1718-26, 3 vols. folio.

EDWARDS, Jonathan, the Elder. The ancestors of Jonathan Edwards in this country were notable men. His great-grandfather, William, and his grandfather, Richard, were among the pillars of society in Hartford, Conn. His father, Rev. Timothy Edwards, was born at Hartford, in May, 1609, graduated with distinguished honor at Harvard College in 1611, ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in "Windsor Farms," now East Windsor, Conn., in 1694. He remained pastor of this church more than sixty-three years, and died Jan. 27, 1758, at the age of eighty-eight. There was a marked resemblance between the sermons of the father and those of his son. The mother of Jonathan Edwards was Esther Stoddard, daughter of the noted "father in Israel," Solomon Stoddard, who for more than fifty-six years (1672-1729) was pastor of the Congregational Church in Northampton, Mass. She was a woman of queenly presence and admirable character. She was born in 1672, married in 1694, became the mother of eleven children, and died in 1770, in the ninety-ninth year of her age. Ten of her eleven children were daughters; Jonathan being the only brother in a nest of sisters, four of whom were elder, and six younger, than himself. He was born in East Windsor, Conn., Oct. 5, 1703. In his early years he was instructed, partly at the public school, chiefly by his parents and sisters, at home. His father being an excellent classical scholar, his mother being uncommonly intelligent and refined, his elder sisters being well trained in Latin and Greek, were the best instructors he could have had. He began the study of Latin when he was only six years old. Before he was thirteen, he had acquired a good knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. In his childhood he was taught to think with his pen in hand. — thus
to think definitely, in order that he might express his thoughts clearly. When he was about nine years old he wrote an interesting letter on Materialism, and when he was about twelve he wrote some remarkable papers on questions in natural philosophy. One month before he was thirteen years of age, he entered Yale College. There he spent four years, and was graduated, with the highest honors of his class, in 1720. At the age of fourteen, one of his college studies was Locke on the Human Understanding: "Taking that book into his hand upon some occasion, not long before his death, he said to some of his select friends who were then with him, that he was beyond expression entertained and pleased with it when he read it in his youth at college; that he was as much engaged, and had more satisfaction and pleasure, in studying it, than the most greedy miser in gathering up handfuls of silver and gold from some new-discovered treasure."

As a child, his sensibilities were often aroused by the truths of religion. He united himself to the church, probably at East Windsor, about the time of his graduation at college. After his graduation he spent nearly two years as a resident scholar in New Haven: then and there he pursued his theological studies. He was "approved" as a preacher in June or July, 1722, several months before he was nineteen years of age. From August, 1722, until April, 1723, he preached to a small Presbyterian Church in New-York city. Here he penned the first thirty-four of his well-known Resolutions, and some exquisitely poetical descriptions of the spiritual life. His eloquence in the pulpit moved his hearers deeply. They desired him to become their pastor, but he felt impelled to labor elsewhere. In September, 1723, he was appointed a tutor in Yale College. He devoted himself to severe study in the winter and spring of 1723-24, and entered on his tutorship in June, 1724. In this office he remained about two years.

On the 15th of February, 1727, when in his twenty-ninth year, he was ordained as pastor of the Congregational Church at Northampton. On the 27th of the next July he was married to Sarah Pierrepont, daughter of Rev. James Pierrepont, "an eminent, pious, and useful minister at New Haven," one of the fathers and trustees of Yale College. At the time of her marriage she was in the eighteenth year of her age, was distinguished by her graceful and expressive features, her vigorous mind, fine culture, and fervent piety. The description which Mr. Edwards gave of her in her girlhood was regarded by Dr. Chalmers as a model of fine writing. During her married life she relieved her husband of many burdens which are commonly laid upon a parish minister, and thus enabled him to pursue his studies with comparatively few interruptions.

During the first two years of his pastorate he was colleague with his grandfather, the celebrated Solomon Stoddard; but in 1729, after the death of his grandfather, he took the entire charge of the congregation. As a youthful preacher he was eminent for his weighty thought and fervid utterance. His voice was not commanding, his gestures were few; he was apt to keep his eye fixed upon one spot above the front gallery of his meeting-house: but many of his sermons were overwhelming. He wrote some of them in full. Often he spoke extempore, often from brief but suggestive notes. The traditions relating to their power and influence appear well-nigh fabulous.

In 1734-35 there occurred in his parish a "great awakening" of religious feeling: in 1740-41 occurred another, which extended through a large part of New England. At this time he became specially intimate with Mr. Whitefield. During these exciting scenes, Mr. Edwards manifested the rare comprehensiveness of his mind. He did not favor the extravagances attending the new measures of the revivalists; but he felt compelled to advocate the principle out of which those extravagances needlessly sprang. He did more, perhaps, than any other American divine in promoting the doctrinal purity, and at the same time quickening the zeal, of the churches; in restraining them from fanaticism, and at the same time stimulating them to a healthy enthusiasm. His writings were in his own day, and are in our day, a kind of classic authority for discriminating between the warmth of sound health and the heat of a fever. He did not remain stationary, like the centre of a circle: he moved in an orbit not eccentric, but well-rounded and complete.

As early as 1744 he preached with great vehemence against certain demoralizing practices in which some of his parishioners indulged. He offended several influential families by his method of opposing those practices. In process of time he became convinced that his grandfather, Mr. Stoddard, was wrong in permitting unconverted persons to partake of the Lord's Supper. He feared, that, in resisting the authority of Mr. Stoddard, he would make a sacrifice of himself. He followed his convictions: he made the sacrifice. After a prolonged and earnest controversy, he was ejected from the pastorate which he had adorned for more than twenty-three years.

In August, 1751, about a year after his dismissal from Northampton, Edwards was elected pastor of the small Congregational Church in Stockbridge, Mass., and missionary of the Housatonic tribe of Indians at that place. Here he was in the wilderness. He was sadly afflicted with the fever and ague and other disorders incident to the new settlement. His labors were interrupted by the French and Indian War. He persevered, however, with marked fidelity in his mission. He preached to the Indians through an interpreter. He gained their admiration and their love.

While living in a kind of exile, among the Indians at Stockbridge, he was invited to the presidency of the college at Princeton, N.J. He was elected to the office on the 26th of September, 1757. He was reluctant to accept it; but finally yielded to the advice of others, and was dismissed from his Stockbridge pastorate, Jan. 4, 1758, after having labored in it six years and a half. He spent a part of January and all of February at Princeton, performing some duties at the college, but was not inaugurated until the 16th of February, 1758. One week after his inauguration he was inoculated for the small-pox. After the ordinary effects of the inoculation he nearly
subsided, a secondary fever supervened, and he died on the 22d of March, 1758. He had then resided at Princeton about nine weeks, and had been the inaugurated president of the college just five weeks. His age was fifty-four years, five months, and seventeen days. His aged father died only two months before him. His son-in-law, President Burr, died in his forty-second year, only six months before his. His daughter, Mrs. Warren (the wife of the late President Burr), died in her twenty-seventh year, only sixteen days after him. His wife died in her forty-ninth year, only six months and ten days after him.

While the pastor at Northampton, President Edwards published the following works: God glorified in Man's Dependence, 1731; A Divine and Supernatural Light Imparted to the Soul by the Spirit of God, 1734 (a sermon noted for its spiritual philosophy; the hearers of it at Northampton requested it for the press); Curse ye Meroz, 1735; A Faithful Narrative of the Surprising Work of God in the Conversion of many Hundreds in Northampton, etc., London, 1736; Five Discourses prefixed to the American Edition of this Narrative, 1738; Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God, 1741 (one of his most terrific sermons; frequently republished; severely criticized without regard to the character and condition of the persons to whom it was preached); Sorrows of the Bereaved spread before Jesus, 1741; Distinguishing Marks of a Work of the True Spirit, 1741; Thoughts on the Revival in New England, etc., 1742; The Watchman's Duty and Account, 1743; The True Excellency of a Gospel Minister, 1744; A Treatise concerning Religious Affections, 1748 (one of his most spiritual and analytical works; "it will no doubt always be considered as one of the most important guards against a spurious religion"); An Humble Attempt to promote Explicit Agreement and Visible Union among God's People in Extraordinary Prayer, 1749; True Saints when Absent from the Body Present with the Lord, 1747; God's Awful Judgments in breaking the Strong Rods of the Community, 1748; Life and Diary of the Rev. David Brainerd, 1749 (a volume which exerted a decisive influence on Henry Martyn, and has affected the missionary spirit of the English as well as American churches: Brainerd was a beloved pupil of Edwards, and was engaged to be married to Edwards's second daughter, Jerusha); Christ the Example of Gospel Ministers, 1749; Qualifications for Full Communion in the Visible Church, 1749 (a treatise of great historical not less than theological importance); Farewell Sermon to the People of Northampton, 1750. After he had left his first pastorate, his more important works were published; some of them not until after his death: Misrepresentations Corrected, and Truth Vindicated, in a Reply to Mr. Solomon Williams's Book on Qualifications for Communion in the Visible Church, 1749 (a treatise of great historical not less than theological importance); Farewell Sermon to the People of Northampton, 1750. After he had left his first pastorate, his more important works were published; some of them not until after his death: Misrepresentations Corrected, and Truth Vindicated, in a Reply to Mr. Solomon Williams's Book on Qualifications for Communion in the Visible Church, 1749 (a treatise of great historical not less than theological importance); Farewell Sermon to the People of Northampton, 1750.
EDWARDS.

the Indian. By these means I acquired the knowledge of that language, and a great facility in speaking it. It became more familiar to me than my mother-tongue. I knew the names of some things in Indian that I did not know in English. Even all my thoughts ran in Indian; and, though the true pronunciation of the language is extremely difficult to all but themselves, they acknowledged that I had acquired it perfectly, as they said, had never been done before by any Anglo-American. On account of my skill in their language in general, I received from them many compliments applauding my superior wisdom. This skill in their language I have in a good measure retained to this day.

The elder Edwards, being himself a missionary to the Indians, intended that his son should be one also, and therefore sent him, in October, 1755, to a settlement of the Oneida Indians, on the banks of the Susquehanna, in order that he might learn their language. At this time the boy was not eleven years old. He was accompanied by his father’s friend, Rev. Gideon Hawley, and resided about six months in the family of Mr. Hawley, the noted missionary to the Oneidas. The boy endeared himself to the Oneida tribe; and on one occasion, when they expected an attack from the French, the Indians took him upon their shoulders, and bore him many miles through the wilderness to a place of safety. The settlement of the Oneidas was about one hundred miles distant from any English settlement; but young Edwards exhibited a rare degree of courage, fortitude, and perseverance. He uttered no complaint, when, in the depth of winter, he was compelled to sleep on the ground in the open air. He returned to Stockbridge in 1756, and resided there until January, 1758, when his father removed to Princeton. In less than ten weeks after that removal the father died, and in less than seven months after the father’s death the mother died; and thus in his fourteenth year young Edwards was left an orphan.

He entered the grammar-school at Princeton in February, 1760; was admitted to Princeton College in September, 1761, and was graduated there in June, 1765. He became a member of the class in 1763, studied theology with Dr. Edward Dorr Griffin, President of Williams College; still another was Dr. Samuel Hopkins. From them, and other pupils were Dr. Samuel Nott and Dr. Jedediah Morse.

One great work of Dr. Edwards’s life was his editorship of his father’s writings. He was an early and confidential friend of Dr. Joseph Bellamy and Dr. Samuel Hopkins. From them, especially from the latter, he obtained many nice discriminations in regard to the President’s theories. He studied the President’s writings with great assiduity. He prepared for the press the President’s History of the Work of Redemption, also his Miscellaneous Observations on Important Theological Subjects, his Remarks on Important Theological Controversies, and two volumes of Sermons. After careful study of his father’s doctrinal system, as that system was modified by Hopkins, Bellamy, Smalley, and others, Dr. Edwards was well fitted to write his noted paper on the *Improvements in Theology* made by President Edwards and those who have followed his Course of Thought. It is in his published works that the influence of the “Half-way Covenant” is most conspicuous. While he was at Cotebrook he published, in 1797, A Dissertation concerning Liberty and Necessity, in Reply to the Rev. Dr. Samuel
W. Perhaps this volume is the fairest exponent yet given of President Edwards's theory of the will.

Dr. Edwards published a large number of articles in the New York Theological Magazine, over the signatures "I. H. and "O. W." He also published many sermons: one in 1788, at the ordination of Rev. Timothy Dwight, at Greenfield, Conn.; one in 1791, on the Injustice and Impolicy of the Slave-trade (Dr. Edwards, like his friend Hopkins, was an early opponent of the slave system); one in 1791, on Human Depravity; one in 1792, at the ordination of Rev. Dan Bradley, at Hampden; one in 1792, at the ordination of Rev. William Brown at Glastenbury; one in 1792 (Concio ad Clerum), preached in the chapel of Yale College, on the Marriage of a Deceased Wife's Sister; one in 1793, on the Death of Roger Sherman; an Election Sermon, in 1794; a Sermon on the Future State of Existence, and the Immortality of the Soul, in 1797; and a Farewell Sermon to the people of Colebrook, in 1798. The most celebrated of his discourses are the three On the Atonement of Jesus Christ, and the Consistency with Free Grace in Forgiveness. They were "preached before his Excellency the Governor, and a large number of both Houses of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, during their sessions at New Haven, in October, 1785, and published by request." They have been frequently republished; and they form the basis of that theory of the atonement which is sometimes called the "Edwardsian theory," and is now commonly adopted by what is termed the "New-England school of divines." Closely connected with this volume was another, entitled The Salvation of All Men. This work was originally published in 1789, but has been frequently republished. It exhibits a singular acuteness of mind, a depth of penetration, a rare precision of thought and style. In 1758 he published a paper which established his fame as a philologist, and has elicited the enthusiastic praises of Humboldt. This work is entitled Observations on the Language of the Muskeketew Indians, in which the English of that Language in North America is shown, its Genius grammatically traced, and some of its Peculiarities, and some Instances of Analogy between that and the Hebrew, are pointed out. These observations were "communicated to the Connecticut Society of Arts and Sciences, and published at the request of the Society." One of the most accomplished of American linguists, Hon. John Pickering, who edited one edition of this paper, says of it, "The work has been for some time well known in Europe, where it has undoubtedly contributed to the diffusion of more just ideas than once prevailed respecting the structure of the Indian languages, and has served to correct some of the errors into which learned men had been led by placing too implicit confidence in the accounts of hasty travellers and blundering interpreters. In the Mikridates, that immortal monument of philological research, Professor Vater refers to it for the information he has given upon the Mohican language, and he has published large extracts from it. To a perfect familiarity with the Muskeketew dialect, Dr. Edwards united a stock of grammatical and other learning which well qualified him for the task of reducing an unwritten language to the rules of grammar."

Nearly all of Dr. Edwards's political writings were collected and reprinted in two octavo volumes, each of above five hundred pages, in 1842. Rev. Tryon Edwards, D.D., edited them, and prefixed to them a Memoir.

Dissimilar as the two Edwardses were in some, they were similar to each other in many respects. Dr. Samuel Miller of Princeton says, "The son greatly resembled his venerable father in metaphysical acuteness, in ardent piety, and in the purest exemplariness of Christian deportment." The son, like the father, was a tutor in the college where he had been a student; was first ordained over a prominent church in the town where his maternal grandfather had been the pastor; was dismissed on account of his doctrinal opinions; was afterwards the minister of a retired parish; was then president of a college; and died at the age of about fifty-five years, soon after his inauguration. His Memoir states that both father and son preached, on the first sabbath of the January preceding their death, from the text, "This year thou shalt die." EDWARDS, Justin, D.D., b. in Westhampton, Mass., April 25, 1787; d. at Virginia Springs, July 29, 1853. He was settled in the ministry at Andover, Mass., 1812-28; was one of the founders of the Tract Society at Boston, 1814; and in 1825, with fifteen others, founded the American Society for the Promotion of Temperance, of which he was, from 1829 to 1836, the efficient secretary. From 1837 to 1842 he was president of the seminary at Andover. In the latter year he became secretary of the American and Foreign Christian Union. He was the author of numerous popular tracts, and a work upon The Sabbath. For several years he was engaged upon a copious and copious Hebrew Commentary, of which the Old Testament was finished; and the first volume of the New Testament was in the press of the American Tract Society, Boston, at the time of his death. See W. A. HALLOCK: Life and Labors of the Rev. Justin Edwards, D.D., N. Y., 1856.

EDZARDI, Ezra, b. at Hamburg, June 28, 1829; d. there Jan. 1, 1708; studied at Leipzig, Wittemberg, and Tubingen, and more especially at Basel, under Buxtorf. On his return to Hamburg he declined to accept any office, and lived as a private teacher of Hebrew, and as a missionary among the Jews. In both respects he was very successful. His fame as a Hebrew scholar drew pupils to his school from all Germany. Most of his writings still remain in manuscript. See MÖLLER: Cimbria literata, III. p. 221; GLEISS: E. E. ein alter Judenfreund, Hamburg, 1871.

EDWARD, Justin, D.D., b. in Westhampton, Mass., April 25, 1787; d. at Virginia Springs, July 29, 1853. He was settled in the ministry at Andover, Mass., 1812-28; was one of the founders of the Tract Society at Boston, 1814; and in 1825, with fifteen others, founded the American Society for the Promotion of Temperance, of which he was, from 1829 to 1836, the efficient secretary. From 1837 to 1842 he was president of the seminary at Andover. In the latter year he became secretary of the American and Foreign Christian Union. He was the author of numerous popular tracts, and a work upon The Sabbath. For several years he was engaged upon a copious and copious Hebrew Commentary, of which the New Testament was finished; and the first volume of the Old Testament was in the press of the American Tract Society, Boston, at the time of his death. See W. A. HALLOCK: Life and Labors of the Rev. Justin Edwards, D.D., N. Y., 1856.

EFFECTUAL CALLING. See CALL.

EGBERT, St., b. in Northumbria [639]; d. at Hy [April 24], 729; was monk in the monas-
EGEBERT.

EGEDE, Hans, the apostle of the Greenlanders, b. at Senjen, in the northern part of Norway, Jan. 31, 1686; d. at Stubbekjobing in the Danish island of Falster, Nov. 5, 1758; studied theology in the University of Copenhagen, and was appointed pastor of Waagen, one of the Lofoten Islands, 1707. In the same year he married Gertrude Rask. From his brother-in-law, a deacon of Bremen, and in 1126 a fixed episcopal see was established, and Egede was made its director. But the attempts failed. The attempt to settle the country was made by Hans Egede. He had made up his mind that he would go thither, and preach the gospel to the heathen savages; and he realized his plan in spite of all difficulties. He first addressed the bishops of Bergen and Drontheim, the newly established committee of missions in Copenhagen (under Frederik IV.), without obtaining anything but bland words. Understanding that he had to take the whole task upon himself, or leave it undone, he resigned his position in Waagen in 1717, and went, with wife and children, to Bergen. By combining a mercantile enterprise with his missionary project he succeeded in forming a company willing to support him; and May 3, 1721, he left Bergen on board the vessel “Hope,” and started for Greenland with his family. In the last moment he received notice from Copenhagen that the king would contribute three hundred dollars a year.

July 3, 1721, Egede landed on the south-western coast of Greenland; and he was immediately met with a disappointment, as the heathen savages turned out to be Esquimaux, and not at all descended from the old Norwegian colonists. A settlement was made, however, at Godl-Haab (“Good Hope”), and the work was begun. The Greenlanders proved ignorant and stupid, kind but shy, and the tradersmen scared them away. Only through the intercourse between his own children and theirs was Egede able to come into relations with them, to learn their language, and to induce them to listen to him. Nevertheless, already in 1728 a new settlement could be made; and Luther’s catechism was translated into the native tongue. But in 1727 the trading company of Bergen dissolved; in 1730 Frederik IV. died; and in 1731 Egede received notice that the royal support would be withdrawn, and that all Europeans should return home immediately, or remain on their own risk. Egede hesitated; but when the Greenlanders themselves implored him to stay, and his wife consented, he remained. The new king, however (Christian VI.), belonged to the Pietists, and when Count Zinzendorf came to Copenhagen he easily induced the king to renew the support: only it was for the future to be divided with another mission, sent out by the Moravian Brethren; and with this mission Egede could not work in harmony. But the troubles thus arising were soon forgotten for that horrible calamity which befell the country in 1735. A Greenland lad returning from Copenhagen brought the small-pox with him; and in the course of a few months more than three thousand people died. The misery was unseizable. The settlements were transformed to graveyards. Egede’s wife died. He himself held out heroically as long as the hardships demanded. But the attempt failed. The Кароль V., he felt himself a broken man. July 29, 1736, he preached his farewell sermon, intrusted the work to his son Paul, and returned to Copenhagen. In Denmark the Greenland mission had in the mean time awakened much interest. A seminary for the education of fit laborers was established, and after the establishment of the new kings, Norway being at that time united with Denmark, tried to vindicate their rights to the country, and establish mercantile connections; but the attempt failed. The attempt to settle the country was made by Hans Egede. He had made up his mind that he would go thither, and preach the gospel to the heathen savages; and he realized his plan in spite of all difficulties. He first addressed the bishops of Bergen and Drontheim, the newly established committee of missions in Copenhagen (under Frederik IV.), without obtaining anything but bland words. Understanding that he had to take the whole task upon himself, or leave it undone, he resigned his position in Waagen in 1717, and went, with wife and children, to Bergen. By combining a mercantile enterprise with his missionary project he succeeded in forming a company willing to support him; and May 3, 1721, he left Bergen on board the vessel “Hope,” and started for Greenland with his family. In the last moment he received notice from Copenhagen that the king would contribute three hundred dollars a year.

July 3, 1721, Egede landed on the south-western coast of Greenland; and he was immediately met with a disappointment, as the heathen savages turned out to be Esquimaux, and not at all descended from the old Norwegian colonists. A settlement was made, however, at Godl-Haab (“Good Hope”), and the work was begun. The Greenlanders proved ignorant and stupid, kind but shy, and the tradersmen scared them away. Only through the intercourse between his own children and theirs was Egede able to come into relations with them, to learn their language, and to induce them to listen to him. Nevertheless, already in 1728 a new settlement could be made; and Luther’s catechism was translated into the native tongue. But in 1727 the trading company of Bergen dissolved; in 1730 Frederik IV. died; and in 1731 Egede received notice that the royal support would be withdrawn, and that all Europeans should return home immediately, or remain on their own risk. Egede hesitated; but when the Greenlanders themselves implored him to stay, and his wife consented, he remained. The new king, however (Christian VI.), belonged to the Pietists, and when Count Zinzendorf came to Copenhagen he easily induced the king to renew the support: only it was for the future to be divided with another mission, sent out by the Moravian Brethren; and with this mission Egede could not work in harmony. But the troubles thus arising were soon forgotten for that horrible calamity which befell the country in 1735. A Greenland lad returning from Copenhagen brought the small-pox with him; and in the course of a few months more than three thousand people died. The misery was unseizable. The settlements were transformed to graveyards. Egede’s wife died. He himself held out heroically as long as the hardships demanded. But the attempt failed. The Кароль V., he felt himself a broken man. July 29, 1736, he preached his farewell sermon, intrusted the work to his son Paul, and returned to Copenhagen. In Denmark the Greenland mission had in the mean time awakened much interest. A seminary for the education of fit laborers was established, and after the establishment of the new kings, Norway being at that time united with Denmark, tried to vindicate their rights to the
his death. His son, Paul Egede, remained in Greenland till 1740, wrote a Greenland grammar and dictionary, and translated the New Testament into Greenland. The Greenland mission was afterwards never abandoned by the Danish Government; and, though the zeal slackened somewhat during the rationalistic period (1790—1820), the Christian Church in Greenland is at present in a flourishing condition. There are no more heathen in the country.


EGIHNARD, or EINHARD, b. in Francia about 770; d. at Seligenstadt, March 14, 844; was educated at the court of Charlemagne, a pupil of Alcuin; acted first as secretary to the emperor, and superintendent of public buildings at Aix-la-Chapelle, then as tutor to the children of Louis le Debonnaire, and retired finally to the monastery which he had founded at Seligenstadt, near Muhihelm, on the Rhine. He wrote a life of Charlemagne, which is invaluable for the general history of the age, and of great interest also to church history. He left seventy-one letters, and a minor essay, De adoranda cruce, which now is lost. His works have been edited by Teulet, Paris, 1840—43, and by Jaffé, in Monumenta Caro-

EGLINUS, Raphael (Latin Iconius), b. at Rüssicken, in the canton of Zürich, Dec. 28, 1559; d. at Marburg, Aug. 20, 1622; studied at Zürich, Geneva, and Basel; settled as a teacher at Son-

EGYPT, Ancient. NAME. — The name ḫrfrw is used by Homer both of the country and of the river which has formed the country, the Nile. Some have derived it from a Semitic root, gyph; others, from a Sanscrit, agupa: but as it occurs only among the Greeks, among peoples connected with the Greeks, its Greek origin seems certain, though no root has been found for it in the Greek language. The native name was Keme, represented hieroglyphically with the ideographic character of the crocodile-tail. It means "black," both in the hieroglyphic inscriptions and in the Coptic language. Egypt was thus called "black country," not on account of the color of the skin of its inhabitants, for that was red and not black, but on account of the color of its soil; the floods of the Nile covering the bottom of the valley with a black mud, and thereby distinguishing the fertile fields from the surrounding deserts. Herodotus noticed that the soil of Egypt resembles neither that of Arabia nor that of Libya, but is black from the mud which the river carries down with it from Ethiopia. The native name has often been brought into connection with the Hebrew name Ham, the name of one of the sons of Noah, the progenitor of the Hamites. But the Hebrew root ham means "hot," and not "black;" though the Hebrew Ham, like the Greek Aithiops, was used as a general designation of the hot southern countries. The common Hebrew designation of Egypt was Masr, or more frequently the dual form Misra'īm, from Matar, to enclose or to watch over. Originally this name was probably used only for the capital, that is, Memphis, just as, in our days, Cairo is called by the Arabs El Ma'ar. The dual form referred to the division into Upper and Lower Egypt being not simply geographical or political, but historical, manifesting itself in the language, customs, and worship of the two peoples. The cuneiform inscriptions show that Ma'ar was generally used in Asia as name for Egypt.

COUNTRY. — Egypt, in the narrower sense of the word, comprises only the Valley of the Nile from the first cataract to the Mediterranean, between 24° 6' and 31° 36' N. Lat. So far as the river runs along undivided, the average breadth of the valley is only about six miles, though occasionally it widens to about sixteen miles; but at 30° N. Lat. both the walls enclosing the valley retreat to the east and to the west, and the river divides into several arms; and forms the low fertile plain of the Delta. Surrounded on the north by the sea, and on all other sides by immense deserts, the long narrow strip of fertile and inhabited country forms an oasis, whose perfectly secluded position has exercised a decisive influence on the
The climate is different in different parts. The Delta near the sea has the common coast-climate of the Mediterranean, and rain is not rare; while in the Thebaid not a cloud is seen on the sky all the year round. The fertility of the country depends altogether on the floods of the Nile, whose regulation and utilization are and always have been of the utmost importance for the welfare of the people. In the southernmost part of Egypt the flood does not now reach the height of the banks any more; and there, as in Nubia, the water has to be raised by means of water-wheels. The annual rise of the Nile is caused by long protracted rains regularly occurring in the tropical highlands between 15° and 16° N. Lat. The flood reaches the first cataract in the middle of June, and the Delta at the end of June. The water rises during three months: at the end of the second month the dams are cut in Upper Egypt, a month later in Lower Egypt, and the waters are let in over the fields. At the end of September the waters retreat; in the course of October the ground becomes dry, and is sown; towards the close of March the harvest begins, the river decreasing all the while until June, when a new rotation begins. Egypt has thus only three seasons, each of four months, — the water-season, June—September; the gardening season, October—January; and the harvest-season, February—May.

Egypt was in antiquity famous for its great fertility. It was the granary of all the neighboring countries. Abraham and the sons of Jacob were attracted to it by its fame for its richness in cattle, sheep, goats, swine, game, wine, figs, fruits, and vegetables of all kinds. In a tomb near the Pyramids of Memphis 835 cows, 220 calves, 700 assels, 974 sheep, and 2,235 goats are enumerated as belonging to the interred person. Among the animals growing in Egypt, the date-palm, which now is of the greatest importance to the country, occurs very seldom, either in the hieroglyphic inscriptions, or in the pictorial representations on the monuments, and the camel not at all. The camel cannot have been entirely unknown to the ancient Egyptians, as it was much used by all neighboring peoples, especially in Palestine, for mercantile expeditions to Egypt (Gen. xxiv. 10, xxx. 43, xxxvii. 29): Pharaoh even presented camels to Abraham (Gen. xii. 16). The horse was also introduced from Asia. During the old empire, before the invasion of the Hyksos, it does not appear: it occurs for the first time during the new empire, in the reign of Thothmes III., in the sixteenth century B.C., in a representation of a procession of foreigners bringing as presents various Asiatic animals, among which are a couple of horses. Under the kings of the nineteenth dynasty great numbers of horses were used, though only to draw the chariots: the Old Testament, however, speaks also of cavalry (Gen. I. 9; Exod. xiv. 9, 23). The animal generally used for riding was the ass, which was kept in great numbers. Wild asses are still found in great herds in the highlands of Nubia. The Leviathan of Job xli. 1 is the crocodile: the Behemoth of Job xii. 15 is the rhinoceros. The country was also rich in minerals and in building-stones. Through the larger part of the country both the walls of the valley consist of limestone of a fine and firm quality. The granite and sienite of beautiful coloring occur in the eastern desert. The palm, the pomegranate, and various kinds of papyrus are found in the Arabian mountains. Gold occurs at Syene, emerald at Berenice. Copper-mines were worked from the oldest times in the Sinaitic peninsula.

History. — The fertility of the soil, the ease of life under a sky always gay, and in a warm, healthy climate, and especially the seclusion of the geographical position of the country, preventing all interference by unruly neighbors, were the natural advantages which made the Egyptians the first people on earth having a history. The historical sense, once awakened, found in the country extensive and abundant materials for its gratification by erecting monuments; and in this respect the Egyptians have preceded and surpassed all other peoples. After further development, a want arose for correct annalistic reports of events requiring an exact chronology; and the monuments even of the first historical epoch, the old engravings on the papyri and loti, are not much more than good material for the edifice of an economical periods based upon long and accurate observation of the stars. What we know chronologically of the first Egyptian
Empire, before the invasion of the Ilyksos, we owe to the work of Manetho (supreme pontiff at Heliopolis), which he wrote in Greek on the command of Ptolemy Philadelphus, drawing his materials from the annals and chronicles of the temple archives. Extracts of this work have come down to us through Josephus, Africanus, and Eusebius; and the historical character of the statement that there ruled thirty dynasties in Egypt before the Greek rule began is proved by the deciphering of the hieroglyphics. Already Champoillon reached back as far as the beginning of the new empire (the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries), and now also the first part of Manetho's dynasties must be considered an indubitable historical fact. A great multitude of monuments, whose dates are ascertainable, present a nearly continuous series of kings as far back as the fourth dynasty; and we have the hieroglyphic names and annalistic reports as far back as Menes himself, the head of the first dynasty. There were originally two different views with respect to Manetho's dynasties: one represented by Bockh, which became the centre of debate and discussion, and the other by Bunsen, 'Aegyptens Stelle in der Weltgeschichte,' Hamburg, 1815, and Lepsius, 'Chronologie der Ägypter,' Berlin, 1848. Bockh holds that the thirty dynasties have succeeded each other, and places the first year of the reign of the first king (Menes) at 3702. Bunsen and Lepsius hold that several of these dynasties have been contemporary, and place the beginning of the Egyptian Empire, the former at 3643, the latter at 3892. The latter view is now generally adopted by Egyptologists.

The Egyptians, like all other peoples, assumed, that, before the human dynasties spoken of in the annals began, there had been a government by gods, and that in three dynasties: the first consisting of Ra, the sun-god, the family of Osiris, and the local god of the oldest royal residences, This, in Upper Egypt; the second of twelve gods, with the moon-god at their head; and the third of thirty demigods. See Lepsius: 'Über den ersten ägyptischen Götterkreis,' Berlin, 1849. Between the government by the gods and the first historical king (Menes) the Egyptians further placed a prehistoric dynasty of so-called Manes, whose residence was at This, the native city of Menes. Menes came from This, and settled in Lower Egypt, where he founded Memphis and the first historical dynasty. During the fourth dynasty the old empire reached its point of culmination. The two largest Pyramids — those of Cheops and Chephren — and the temples and statues of the inscriptions were then built. From the tombs arranged around the royal Pyramids, partly hewn into the cliffs, and especially from the chambers destined for the worship of the dead, with their innumerable inscriptions and pictorial representations, we derive a surprisingly complete idea of the life which the Egyptians then led — their arts and trades, their riches, customs, offices, honors, their worship of the gods and the dead, etc. More than three thousand years before Christ, while all the rest of the world is still musing an empty question, and the equations of which he extracted from Manetho; and he does not notice that he is in complete contradiction to his source. An impartial examination of
the statements of Manetho does not leave it in the least doubtful that the Egyptians themselves considered the two events as entirely different. According to Manetho, the expulsion of the Hyksos from Avaris took place under King Thothmose, or Tuthmosis (Tuthmoses) III.; while the exodus of the Israelites—which by Egyptian history is generally spoken of as the expulsion of a rebellious tribe under the leadership of a Heliopolitan priest, Osarsiph, who afterwards called himself Moses—took place under a king who was the son of a Rameses and the father of a Sethos, and who consequently can be no other than the Menophes, or Menephthes (Africanus reads Ammenophes), of the list of Manetho, who was the son of Rameses II. and the father of Sethos II. (Josephus calls him sometimes Amenophes, and sometimes Menophis). As the two kings, Thothmoses III., and Menophes, denote the beginning and the close of the epoch of the greatest prosperity of Egypt, they are both perfectly well known to us through the monuments. The former lived about two hundred and fifty years later than the latter, and that period consequently separated the two events from each other.

With respect to Manetho’s views of the two events there can be no difference of opinion. The date of the reign of King Menophes can be ascertained from the fact that the last Sothis period, beginning 1322 B.C., and ending 139 A.D., was, according to the mathematician Theon of Alexandria, called the era of Menophes, because it opened during his reign. The question now arises, How do the statements of the Old Testament correspond with those of the Egyptian historian? They are so far from contradicting each other, that, on the contrary, the Egyptian tradition would receive its most decided confirmation from the Hebrew documents, if we could presume a mistake in the latter’s calculation of the period between the exodus and the building of the temple, which, according to 1 Kings vi. 1, comprised four hundred and eighty years. But this figure does not harmonize with the figures in the Book of Judges, or with the reading of the Septuagint, or with the view of the author of Acts (xiii. 20, or with the view of Joseph, Ant., viii. 3, 17; C. Ap. 2, 2). Most of these deviations arrive at still higher figures; but an impartial investigation and a comparison of the genealogical tables, of which especially the Levitical can claim the highest trustworthiness, bring out a much lower figure, but one which exactly corresponds with the Egyptian tradition. A piece of evidence of the greatest importance is derived from a circumstance mentioned in the Hebrew narrative, and pointing decisively to the date indicated. It is the building by the Jews of the cities of Pithom and Rameses, under the predecessor of the Pharaoh of the Exodus that is, Rameses II. From the monuments we know that this powerful Pharaoh dug many canals, and founded many cities, and, more especially, that he constructed the great canal in the province of Goshen, which afterwards was used to complete the communication between the Red Sea and the Nile, and at whose western termination Pithom (Patham, or Pithom) was situated, as its statue, as the hero eponymos of the city, stood in the sanctuary of the temple.

That the Israelites did not arrive in Egypt until after the expulsion of the Hyksos, is evident from every detail of the Hebrew narrative. It is not an Arab, but a genuinely Egyptian court, at which Jacob is received. The king bears the Egyptian title of “king.” Joseph has an Egyptian name, Zaphnathpaneakh (“the savior of life”). The officers of the king have also Egyptian names, such as Potiphar (“consecrated to Pha”). Joseph speaks to his brothers through an interpreter; and the Egyptians refuse to eat bread with them, because they are shepherds, etc. Still more decisive is the circumstance, that the expulsion of the Hyksos, the greatest historical event of the age, is even not alluded to in the Bible; which would be inexplicable if it had taken place while the Israelites were in Goshen, under the father or grandfather of Moses. To all this may be added, that the important political reforms which, according to the Old Testament (Gen. xlvii. 20–29), were introduced into Egypt by Joseph, are mentioned and described with essential similarity both by Herodotus (II., 108, 37) and Diodorus (I., 54, 73, 74), who ascribe them to King Sesostris, or Sesoises; that is, Sethos I., whose reign began in the middle of the fifteenth century B.C.

Of the three kings of the nineteenth dynasty whom we know best,—Sethos I., under whom Joseph arrived in Egypt; Rameses II., at whose court Moses was educated; and Menophes, in whose reign the exodus took place,—Rameses II. is by far the greatest; yes, we may say that under him the Egyptian Empire reached the culminating point of its power and fame. His successor, Menophes, under whom Moses led the Israelites out of Egypt, and founded the Jewish theocracy, is by Herodotus (I., 111) described as a weak but haughty man, smitten with blindness for ten years as a punishment of godlessness. (“He impiously hurled his spear into the overflowing waves of the river, which a sudden wind caused to rise to an extraordinary height.”)

Under the last kings of the nineteenth dynasty, and under the following dynasties, the empire gradually fell into decay. At length only the kingdom of Thebes was left, and that kingdom was by Herodotus (I., 111) described as a weak but haughty man, smitten with blindness for ten years as a punishment of godlessness. (“He impiously hurled his spear into the overflowing waves of the river, which a sudden wind caused to rise to an extraordinary height.”)

The royal family of Thebes was afterwards succeeded by other families from Tanis, Bubastis, and Sais in Lower Egypt; and towards the close of the eighth century the decaying empire fell into the hands of the Ethiopian conqueror Shabaka, the Tirhakah of the Old Testament (2 Kings xix. 9; Isa. xxxvii. 9), constituting, according
to Manetho, the twenty-fifth dynasty. Tirhakah afterwards retired to the old Ethiopian residence on the mountain of Barkal, the Meroe of Herodotus, where he built several temples, the names upon whose ruins show that his dynasty still flourished there for a long time.

When the Ethiopians had gone, there followed a period of dissolution and confusion, described by Herodotus as the dodekarchy, but not mentioned by Manetho, who speaks only of the legitimate rulers. Finally, Psammetichus I., one of the dodekarchs, and the legitimate heir of the crown, succeeded in putting an end to the anarchy; and under him and his successors, forming the twenty-sixth dynasty, the country once more enjoyed a period of great prosperity. Psammetichus I. ascended the throne by the aid of Ionian and Carian mercenaries, and in reward he gave them large estates and great privileges, which no doubt was the reason why, during his reign, a large portion of the national warriors emigrated to Ethiopia. The Greek colony in the country increased rapidly. Amasis allowed them to build the city of Byzantium, which became an important commercial port. The gates of Egypt were opened to foreign commerce, and greater riches flowed into her lap than in the times of the victories of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties.

The number of cities is said to have increased under Amasis to twenty thousand; and private people were able to build for themselves rock tombs larger and more magnificent than the royal tombs of Bab-el-meluk. But the military strength of the country did not increase in a corresponding measure, and the empire finally succumbed before the power of Persia. From 525 to 504 Egypt was a Persian province; and, though she once more enjoyed a short period of independence under the twenty-ninth and thirtieth dynasties, she was conquered a second time by the Persians in 340, and fell in 332 to Alexander, who founded Alexandria, where he was buried (323).

During this period, Greek curiosity, still unfilled, was increased by the discovery of the royal tombs of Bab-eLmeluk. But the military infiltration of the Oriental into the Greek civilization, was translated into Greek. While this infiltration of Orient into Egypt was still going on, Egypt finally lost its independence under Cleopatra VI. After the battle of Actium (30 B.C.), the country was incorporated with the Roman Empire. Already in the first century after Christ, Christianity was introduced into Egypt, and spread rapidly, though hieroglyphical inscriptions are found in the temples of Esnah dating from the middle of the third century; and the Isis-worship at Philae did not cease completely until the middle of the sixth century, under Justinian.


Recent Discoveries.—In the summer of 1881 there were discovered in a cave near Thebes thirty-nine royal mummies, besides papyrus rolls and other objects of interest and value. Among the mummies was that of Rameses II., the Pharaoh of the oppression. It was in a perfect state of preservation, in a mummy-case of plain sycamore, in a perfect state of preservation, in a mummy-case of plain sycamore, with the mummy itself wound in rose-colored and silver-embroidered shrouds. The bands which pass across the shrouds to keep them in place bears a hieratic inscription stating:
that this (the mummy of Rameses II.) was concealed in a pit at a time when a foreign army invaded Egypt. In January, 1882, G. Maspero, the director of the Boolak Museum, made his official report of this remarkable discovery.

Another discovery in 1881 was that of a trilingual stela containing the decree of the sovereign of priests assembled at Canopus, ordaining the deification of Berenice, the daughter of Polycrates Euergetes (q.v.), and creating a fifth order of priests, to be called Euergetes. This Ptolemy is supposed to have been prophetically described Dan. xi. 7, 8. He was one of Egypt’s greatest rulers. The date of the decree is B.C. 238, and it is therefore a century older than the Rosetta Stone. The inscription upon the newly discovered tablet is the same as that upon the stone of Sán, discovered in 1865, but better preserved.

The year 1881 witnessed also the opening of the Pyramid of Maydoom, which is a century older than the Great Pyramid of Cheops, and probably is the tomb of Snefroo of the third dynasty, B.C. 4200 or 3766. Meanwhile, our knowledge is being increased through the correct decipherment of the demotic writing, which was a very much abbreviated form of the hieratic,—the usual style of penmanship employed by the priests. In the demotic the ordinary business and legal transactions of the Egyptians were recorded. From the numerous documents written in it which have been preserved, an insight will be given into the laws, social state, customs and manners, of the Egyptians, such as is not afforded by those in the monumental styles of the hieroglyphic and hieratic. But there is a growing conviction among Egyptologists, that the earliest Egyptian civilization we know of is the highest, and that all we know of it is its decadence.

RELIGION OF ANCIENT EGYPT.—The Egyptians were among the most religious of the ancient nations. It is true that the principal reason why most of the documents which have come down to us are of a religious character is that all the ancient monuments of Egypt have perished, except some which were necessarily of a religious nature,—the temples and the tombs. The palaces of kings and nobles have utterly disappeared. Our knowledge of Egyptian civil architecture is derived from paintings in the tombs. Many texts of historical interest have been preserved; but the original intention was not historical, but religious. Religion in some form or other was dominant in every relation of life in ancient Egypt. The Egyptian deities were literally innumerable. Every town and village had its local patron. Every month of the year, every day of the month, every hour of the day and of the night, had its presiding divinity. All these gods had to be propitiated; and Egyptian life thus became a constant round of religious and semi-religious ceremonies and festivals which amazed the beholder. In the middle of the fifth century B.C., the first remark he made of the people was that they were religious to excess. He said it was easier to find a god in Egypt than a man.

In order to reduce this bewildering multitude of deities to something like a mythological system, it is only necessary to notice that special titles and names were given to deities according to the place in which they were worshipped. Thus Osiris was called Che (“the child”) at Thebes, Ura (“the great one”) at Helioi, Oti (“the sovereign”) at Memphis, and of Hathor, Nefertiti was identical with Isis at Denderah, with Sechet at Memphis, with Neith at Sais, with Saosis at Helioi, with Nehemanit at Hermopolis, with Bast at Bubastis, with Sothis at Elephantine, etc.

Hence the explanation of the singular fact that Apis is called the son of Ptah, of Tum, of Osiris, and of Sokari; that Horus is called the son of Isis and of Hathor; that Osiris is called the father, brother, husband, and son of Isis, and also the son of their child Horus; that Horus is said to have been born in Tattu, but also in Cheb, etc. What at first glance represents itself as different deities is in reality only different aspects of the same deity. That Egypt which Menes first gathered together under one sceptre was a country divided up into nomes. Each nome had its own capital, and each capital had its own gods with their special names. But it is only the names which are different: the doctrines are the same. It is evident that Mentu and Tum, two of the great gods of Thebes, are merely individual or local aspects of the sun-god Ra; and so are Ptah and Ammon: indeed, the whole swarm of gods of the first order is easily reduced to two groups; the first representing the sun-god Ra and his family, and the second, Osiris and his family. Ra is not only the name of the sun-god, but also the word commonly used to denote the sun itself. In other mythologies the sun-god generally rides across the sky in a chariot drawn by horses: in Egypt he sails in a boat. The sky is conceived as an expanse of water, to which the Nile forms the earthly counterpart. The adversary of Ra is Apap, and the conflict between them is that between light and darkness. Osiris is the eldest son of Seb (“the earth”) and Nut (“the sky”), but more powerful than his parents. He wedded his sister Isis whilst they were yet in their mother’s womb, and their son was Horus. Osiris’ adversary is Set, who shall slay him; but he shall be avenged by Horus. Osiris means the same as Ra, only his myth is more elaborate and wilder in its features. Already in antiquity it was the subject of much subtle meditation and many fanciful interpretations. Modern mythologists do not find it difficult,—either with this particular myth, or with the whole Egyptian mythology—to go behind the wild, gaudy, coarse, and often ridiculous polytheism, which was the religion of the multitude, to the subtle, mystical, often sublime monotheism, which was the heart and conscience of the educated classes.

Egyptian religion, considered not as a mythological system, but in its bearing upon morals and practical life in general, presents two very remarkable features,—its worship of the dead, and its worship of sacred animals. In Egyptian life the tomb played a much more prominent part than any other feature. Religion of some kind or another was attached to the permanence of the tomb, to the continuance of the religious ceremonies, and
even to the prayers of passers-by. We constantly find men praised for having made the names of their father and mother, or of their "fathers," live again. Ancestor-worship, however, even though it may not be the first origin of all religion, is a part of human nature itself, commands respect, even when it presents itself under very curious forms, and will continue under some refined form as long as human nature keeps whole and sound. But animal worship is always a strange phenomenon, and it became especially so in Egypt on account of the grotesque forms under which it presented itself. Some kinds of animals were held sacred universally, others received only a local veneration. To the first class belonged the cat, sacred to Bast or Sekhet; the ibis and the cynocephalous ape, sacred to Thoth; the hawk and the pelican, sacred to Ra, etc. None of these animals were allowed to be killed or injured. In each locality where any kind of animal was sacred, some individuals of the species were attached to the principal temple, where they had their special shrines or chambers, and their train of attendants and bodyguards cleansed and cleaned them. When they died, they were embalmed according to the most approved method, and entombed with much pomp and ceremony. The origin of this animal-worship may have been natural enough, starting from the idea of transmigration; but its continuance down to the third century of our era exposed the Egyptians to the laughter and contempt of the rest of the civilized world. The Greek comedy-writers of the middle and of the last school, and the Christian fathers, as, for instance, Clemens Alexandrinus and Origens, agree in their feelings on this point. See P. Lé Page Renouf: Religion of Ancient Egypt (the Hibbert Lectures for 1879), New York, 1880, from which these last paragraphs have been chiefly drawn.

RELATIONS OF EGYPT AND THE BIBLE.—With Abraham the mention of Egypt in the Bible begins, and is, as always, minutely accurate (Gen. xii. 10—xiii. 3). The plenty in Egypt that time was the attraction, for the overflowing of the Nile has always blessed that land. Sarah was unveiled (xii. 11), for at that time women upon the monuments always appear so. No mention is made of horses (xii. 16, xiii. 2) in the caravans which accompanied him thither, nor among his presents when he went away, for none are portrayed until Thothmes III., neither are camels; but bones of dromedaries were dug up in the Delta in 1852. His arrival was announced to the Pharaoh (xii. 15, 18), since strangers from Asia were personally examined by the monarch; and permission to remain, if given, was by a duly certified document. Sarah was taken into the royal harem, as the tale of The Two Brothers (trans. in Records of the Past, vol. ii. 187—192) shows was customary in the case of beautiful women.

The next mention of Egypt is in the history of Joseph (Gen. xxxix.—li.), which is truthful and accurate beyond doubt. The Midianites brought "spicery, balm, and myrrh" (xxxvii. 26),—articles necessary to embalming. Joseph was sold (xxxvii. 36) to Potiphar ("consecrated to the god Phra, i.e., the sun") the captain of the guard, which had its headquarters in a famous fortress, known to the Romans as the "White Castle," at Memphis. A papyrus of the period states the daily quantum of bread supplied to the fortress (xxxix. 5, 6). The wives of the Egyptian nobles were also well reproached (xxxix. 7—17; cf. The Two Brothers). The very prison where Joseph was confined is copied upon an existing mosaic found in a Roman house at Preneste (see woodcut in Geikie's Hours with the Bible, vol. i. p. 461). The wine-drinking habits of the country (xi. 1) are illustrated by the tombs of Beni Hasan, built long before Abraham. The importance of dreams was universally granted in antiquity; but Joseph dared a good deal in invading priestly prerogatives in interpreting those of his fellow-prisoners (xi.). His sudden call to the presence of the Pharaoh (a Hyksos), Apepi, according to Brugsch, cleanly dressed and closely shaven (xii. 14), as custom demanded, and his sudden promotion (xii. 41), are thoroughly Egyptian. So, too, are the insignia of his rank, the new name, and the mode of his public reception (xii. 42, 43). By his marriage with Asenath ("devoted to Neith"), the princess of a great university temple of the Sun at On, near Memphis, he was incorporated into the priesthood, and therefore into the highest class of the land. The "divining bowl," which comes up in the subsequent narrative (xlv.), is a proof how a man's environment saps his faith. Brugsch finds an allusion to the seven years of famine in an inscription at El-kab from the age of Joseph: "I gathered grain, a friend of the god of harvest; I was watchful at the seed-time, and, when a famine arose through many years, I distributed the grain through the town in every famine." The land of Goshen, where Joseph settled his family (Gen. xlvi. 4), was admirably adapted for the purpose. It lay on the north-east of the Delta, toward the Isthmus of Suez, and was isolated from the native Egyptians in the Valley of the Nile, who held in abhorrence all shepherds (xlii. 34). Goshen was famous for its fertility; and, being especially fitted for tillage, the Israelites there were providentially led to change from a pastoral to an agricultural people. To the south were Memphis, the ancient capital, and On, the seat of a great university. In direct contact with Egyptian pomp, at a period when the nation was at its height, the Israelites lived unmolested for four hundred years. The Pharaoh who welcomed them was a Hyksos king; but after a struggle of a hundred and fifty years the Hyksos were driven out, and a native dynasty once more reigned. Then began oppression. They were set to building and beautifying cities (Exod. i. 11). The outrages to which the modern fellahin in Egypt are subjected give an idea of the sore trials of the chosen people. But "at evening time it shall be light," and to the weary Israelites day was about to dawn; for in one of their most pious families, to judge by the names of his parents,'—Amram ("kindred of the Lofty One") and Jochebed ("my glory is Jehovah") (vi. 20),—Moses, their future savior, was born (ii. 2). By the instrumentality of Pharaoh's daughter, as Josephus calls the princess who found him (one of the wives of Rameses II., as a contemporary document proves), he was taught all the learning of the Egyptians. But his mother was
his first teacher, and from her he received his religion. His killing of an officer was the cause of his flight, rendered more imperative because he had buried the body in the sand (ii. 12), and thus prevented its embalming, without which, according to Egyptian belief, the dead man’s soul could not live.

When Moses returned, Menephta, the thirteenth son of Rameses, was on the throne. The thousand horsemen, and took all the walled towns because he had buried the body in the sand.

That a greater than any god in their divinity; (10) the destruction of the first-born of divinities who had charge of the air; (8) The following gods were mocked: (1) Osiris, the great idolatry of Egypt. By them, in order, the following gods were mocked: (1) Osiris, the great god of the Nile, the sacred river; (2) Ileki, the “driver away of frogs;” (3) and (4) The fly gods; (5) The sacred ram worshipped at Thebes, and the sacred ox at Memphis and On; (6) “Human sacrifices of foreigners were offered yearly, and the sacred ox at Memphis an On; (6) “Human sacrifices of foreigners were offered yearly, and their ashes scattered in the air, to avert evil from the land; but now ashes similarly cast abroad carried misery far and near;” (7) The multitude of divinities who had charge of the air; (8) The insect gods; (9) The sun, the chief Egyptian divinity; (10) The destruction of the first-born put the whole religion to shame; for it demonstrated that a greater than any god in their pantheon had the Egyptians in his power, and favored unmistakably the despised Israelites.

For a discussion of the exodus, see EXODUS OF THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL.

The references to Egypt after the exodus are few and incidental, although several Pharaohs are named. Sheshonk, or Shishak, in the ninth year of Rehoboam (909 B.C.) came up against Jerusalem with twelve hundred chariots and sixty thousand horsemen, and took all the walled towns of Judah (2 Chron. xii.). Upon the south wall of the Temple of Karnak is inscribed, among the conquered kings, “Yuthmalk:” probably Rehoboam is meant. Osarchon, or Zerah, the Ethiopian who was expelled by Asa 940 B.C. (2 Chron. xiv. 8), is inscribed on the same temple. In 1876 an inscription of Tirhakah (2 Kings xix. 9), contemporary of Hezekiah (700 B.C.), who defeated Sennacherib, was discovered at Tanis (the Bible Zaan). Pharaoh-Iphhra is mentioned in Jer. xlv. 30. A recently deciphered cuneiform inscription proves that Jeremiah’s prophecy was fulfilled in the thirty-seventh year of Nebuchadnezzar. Pharaoh-Nechoh (2 Kings xxiii. 29) is sculptured at Thebes. See Hengstenberg: Egypt and the Books of Moses, Eng. trans., Edin., 1847; Ebers: Agypten u. d. Bücher Moses, Leipzig, vol. i, 1889; Vigouroux: Le Bible et les découvertes modernes en Égypte et en Assyrie, Paris, 1877; Schaff: Through Bible Lands, N.Y., 1879; S. C. Bartlett: Egypt to Palestine, N.Y., 1879; C. Geikie: Hours with the Bible, Lond. and N.Y., 1881 sqq.

Christianity in Egypt dates, according to tradition, from St. Mark the evangelist, who is said to have founded the church there. This became afterwards a metropolitan and even a patriarchal see. In the second century, Alexandria (see art.) was the seat of a theological school where the great Origen taught. It flourished for two centuries, and trained some of the most distinguished divines of the Greek Church. Nevertheless, Christianity seem to have permeated the entire people, nor altered very much many of those who were superficially affected by it; for the great mass of the people simply exchanged a gross for a refined idolatry. The Arabs swept over Egypt, and at the sword-point forced Mohammedanism upon the nation; and in this religion they have ever since remained. Yet a considerable number of Christian Egyptians remained faithful, and their descendants constitute the present Coptic Church. See Corr. They are schismatics, rejecting the orthodox dogma of the two natures of Christ. As in ability and training they are superior to the Arabs, they hold most of the government clerkships. In November, 1854, the United Presbyterian Church of America began in Alexandria, and especially in Cairo, a work among these degenerate Christians. It was not the first attempt to preach among them Protestant Christianity; for the Moravians in 1769, and the Church Missionary Society of London in 1826, started missions among them. But the first was abandoned in 1782, owing to the unfavorable character of the times, and the second after a quarter-century of effort, when the delusion of the hope of a reform inside the Coptic Church was demonstrated. The United Presbyterians were more favored as to time, and wisely adopted a different method. Not to reanimate, but to regenerate, has been their aim. For the first ten years they limited their efforts to the two principal cities; but since then they have extended their operations to Middle and Upper Egypt. From Alexandria, along the Nile to Nubia, they had (1851) four central stations (Alexandria, Cairo, Sinoris, and Osiout), forty out-stations, eight ordained foreign missionaries, sixteen female foreign assistants, a hundred and forty-nine native helpers, and over a thousand communicants. In Cairo and Osiout the mission has acquired valuable property, and in the latter place has even a college and theological seminary for training a native clergy.

Miss M. L. Whately, a daughter of the late Archbishop of Dublin, has for the past twenty years conducted a school in Cairo for the training of Arab youth. It is unsectarian, but strongly Christian, and spreads Bible truth into households which otherwise would be wholly inaccessible. There are also a few English and German churches in Alexandria and Cairo for the foreign population there.

The Roman-Catholic Church has also a hold in Egypt; and there is a sect, called the United Copts, which acknowledge the papal supremacy.
ECHORN, Johann Gottfried, b. at Dürrnitzern, in the principality of Hohenlohe-Oehningen, Oct. 16, 1752; d. at Göttingen, June 27, 1827; studied at Göttingen, and was appointed professor of Oriental languages and literatures at Jena in 1775, and professor of theology at Göttingen in 1781. To his Jena residence belong Gesch. d. ostindischen Handels vor Mohamméd (Gotha, 1775), Monumenta antiquissima historia Arabum (Gotha, 1775), De rei nummariae apud Arabes initio (Jena, 1776), Der Naturmensch, a translation of an Arab romance (Berlin, 1783), a great number of historical and critical essays in his Repertorium für biblische und morgenländische Litteratur (18 vols., 1777-86), which from 1787 to 1803 was followed by his Allgemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Litteratur (10 vols.), and finally his Einleitung in’s Alte Testament (Leipzig, 1789-93, 3 vols.), a work written with great boldness and enthusiasm, and acknowledged by its times as a new departure in theological science. To his Göttingen residence belong his Einleitung in d. apokryphischen Bücher des A. T. (1795: Krutsche Schriften, I.—IV.), Einleitung in d. N. T. (1804-12: Kritische Schriften, V.—VII.), Die Propheten (3 vols., 1816-19), a number of voluminous works on history, Weltgeschichte (5 vols., 1801-14), Gesch. d. drei letzten Jahrhunderte (1803, 1804), Gesch. d. Litteratur von ihrem Anfange bis auf d. neuesten Zeiten (5 vols., 1805), etc., besides a multitude of minor essays and reviews. When it is remembered that during fifty-two years he lectured every day three hours in the university, his activity is simply amazing. His historical writings have now fallen into oblivion; but his works on biblical criticism, though their rationalistic tendency has been completely overthrown, are still acknowledged to contain many happy views and profound investigations. See H. EWALD: Jahr bücher d. bibl. Wissenschaft, I, 1849, Die ehemaligen Göttin. Lehrer, J. D. Michaelis, J. G. Eichhorn, Th. Chr. Tychtzan.

EICHORN, Karl Friedrich, son of J. G. Eichhorn; b. at Jena, Nov. 20, 1794; d. at Berlin, July 5, 1854; studied law at Göttingen, Wetzlar, and Vienna; and was appointed professor of law at Francfort-on-the-Oder in 1805, at Berlin in 1811, at Göttingen in 1817, and again at Berlin in 1832. His Grundsätze d. Kirchenrechts d. kathol. u. d. evangel. Religionspartei in Deutschland, 1831-38, is one of his best works, and the first attempt to apply the principles of the so-called historical school to ecclesiastical law. See HUGO LOERCH: Briefe von K. F. Eichhorn, Bonn, 1881.

EINHERD. See EINHARD.

EINSIEDELN, or MARIA-EINSIEDELN, a Benedictine monastery in Switzerland, and a famous place of pilgrimage. In the first half of the ninth century Megirnad, or Meinrad, from Sulichgau, in the Neckar region, settled on the top of the Etzel, a cliff on the southern shore of the Lake of Zürich, whence he afterwards penetrated far into the Alps, with his followers, until in 861 he was murdered by robbers in his cell. In the beginning of the tenth century Benu and Eberhard from Strassburg came to the spot where St. Meinrad had been murdered; and there they founded a monastery, which was splendidly endowed by Otho I. and Otho II., and prospered much. It never attained, however, the celebrity of the neighboring St. Gall; and when the Reformation began, it became almost completely deserted. Abbot Joachim Eichhorn (1544-89) retrieved its good fortune, and made it a strong hold for the counter-Reformation. The French invasion of 1798 it also outlived; and when, in 1861, it celebrated the five hundredth anniversary, it numbered about a hundred inmates, and was visited by about a hundred and fifty thousand pilgrims. The object of the pilgrimage is a visit to the black image of the Virgin, preserved in a separate chapel; and the origin of a special devotion in this chapel is, according to the legend, the circumstance that on Sept. 14, 948, Mary herself and the angels came down from heaven, and consecrated the chapel. Materials for the history of the institution are found in Documenta Archivii Einedensiani, published in 3 vols. fol. in the seventeenth century, under Abbot Placidus Heymann; and a new series was given in 1812 by the librarian P. Chr. Hartmann, in his Annales Heremi. MEYER VON KRONAU.

EISENMENGER, Johann Andreas, b. at Mannheim, 1654; d. at Heidelberg, Dec. 20, 1704; was educated in the Collegium Sapientiae, and studied Hebrew and Arabic in Holland and England; was appointed registrar at the Palatine court in 1693, and professor of Oriental languages at Heidelberg in 1700. The fanatical hatred of Christianity which characterized the Jewish rabbins of that period, especially his teacher of Hebrew, the famous David Lida, engendered an opposite fanaticism in him; and he spent nineteen years in writing his Entdecktes Judenthum, a curious and learned but exceedingly one-sided and spiteful representation of Judaism. When the book was printed, the Jews procured an inhibition against its publication from the emperor, and even offered to buy the whole edition for twelve thousand florins; but Eismenmenger demanded thirty thousand. After the death of the author, the Prussian king, Friedrich I., appealed to the emperor on behalf of the heirs, but in vain. Finally, however, the book was printed at Königs burg (1711) at the expense of the Prussian king. Eismenmenger's Lexicon Orientale Harmonicum was never printed. His edition of the Hebrew Bible (without points), which he undertook in connection with Leusden, was published 1694.

EKKEHARD. is the name of several monks of literary fame, of the Monastery of St. Gall. — Ekkehard the First, d. 973; was educated there; became director of the cloister-school, and dean of the convent, and made the place a centre of learning and study. He wrote hymns, and a Latin poem on the life and deeds of Walter of Aquitania, last ed. by R. Peiper, Berlin, 1873. — Ekkehard the Second (surnamed Palatinus), d. April 23, 990; was a nephew of the preceding, and educated by him; taught for some time in the school of St. Gall, but was by the Duchess Hedwig of Slesvig invited to Hohentwiel, where he taught the duchess Latin and Greek. He was afterwards drawn to the imperial court as one of the chaplains of Otho II., and was finally provost of the Cathedral of Mayence. — Ekkehard the Third was a cousin of the second, and accompanied him to Hohentwiel as teacher of the young clerks at the court of the duchess.
He afterwards returned to St. Gall, and died, as dean of the convent, in the beginning of the eleventh century. — **Ekkehard the Fourth** (Etke- 
hardus junior), b. about 961; d. about 1060; was educated at St. Gall by the celebrated Notker Labech, and became early a master in Latin, Greek, mathematics, astronomy, and music. In 1022 he was invited to Mayence by Archbishop Aribo as director of the cathedral school; but in 1024 he returned to St. Gall. He continued the chronicle of St. Gall, *Canus Monasterii Sancti Galli* (Monum. Germ. Hist. Script., II. pp. 74–163), commenced by Ratpertus. He made a collection of hymns (*Liber Benedictinonum*), wrote a poem (*De ornatu dictioni*), and translated into Latin the Life of St. Gall, written in German by Ratpertus. — **Ekkehard the Fifth** (surnamed Minimus) lived in the beginning of the twelfth century, and wrote a *Vita Sancti Notkeri*, of no great inter-
est. — See **Meyer von Knonau: Die Ekkeharte von St. Gallen**, Basel, 1876. ALBRECHT VOGEL.

**ELAGABALUS.** See Heliogabalus.

**ELAM (highland),** the classical Elamia, was the name of a country east of Babylonia, on the other side of the Tigris, bounded north by Assyria and media, east by Media and Persia, and south by the Persian Gulf. Its capital was Susa. According to Gen. x. 22 this land was inhabited by descendants of Shem, and called after his son Elam. But from the circumstance that the Hebrews called the land Elam, and the Assyrian inscriptions Ilam, or llamti, it cannot be inferred that the people itself also used the name: on the contrary, the Elamites named themselves after their principal cities,— Kis, whence the Greek Cissia; Uways, whence the Greek Uxissae, etc. When the Shemites settled in Elam, they found there, as in Babylonia, a primitive non-Semitic population; but while, in Babylonia, the Shemites gained the ascendency over, in Elam they were absorbed by, that population, as is proved by the circumstance that the language of the inhabitants in Elam does not belong to the Semitic, but to the Altai-Turanian stock. In the time of Abram the Elamites were quite a powerful nation (Gen. xiv. 9). By the Assyrians, however, they were conquered; and they followed Sennacherib's army when he invaded Judaea ( Isa. xxii. 6). After wards they once more became independent; and Jeremiah mentions them among those nations upon which the wrath of God was about to descend (Jer. xliv. 34–38). The doom came with Nebuchadnezzar. After the fall of Babyl on they were incorporated with the Persian, then with the Syro-Macedonian, and finally with the Parthian Empire. A remarkable confirma-
tion of the Scripture is a record of the Assyrian Assur-banipal (B.C. 668–629), recently deciphered: "In my fifth expedition, to Elam I directed the march... I overwhelmed Elam through its extent... cut off the head of Tukman, their white king, who desired evil. Beyond a city I slew his soldiers; alive in hand I captured his fighting men" (*Records of the Past*, vol. i. p. 71).

**ELATH, or ELOTH (strong trees),** a seaport at the northern extremity of the eastern arm of the Red Sea, the Gulf of Akabah, be longing to the Edomites, and a part of Elam in its trade with the Indies. Israel passed by it on their exodus from Egypt; and David con quered it (Deut. ii. 8; 2 Sam. xvii. 14). From it and Ezion-geber Solomon sent his ships to Ophir (1 Kings ix. 28); but after his death it was retaken by the Edomites (2 Kings xii. 20), and was only for a short time in the possession of Israel, during the reign of Uzziah (2 Kings xiv. 22; 2 Chron. xxvi. 2). Under the Romans it was still an important mercantile place, the station of a legion, and the seat of a bishop, present at various councils between 320 and 630.

Under the Mohammedans it lost its trade. Various ineffectual attempts were made by the crus aders and the kings of Jerusalem to regain it. About 1300, at the time of Alphedena, it had been completely deserted. The present town of Ak a bah consists only of some scattered huts, and an old fortress with towers, occupied by some Turk ish troops. It forms the tenth station on the pilgrims' route from Cairo.

**ELCESAITES.** See Elkesaites.

**Elder.** See Presbyter.

**Elders Among the Hebrews** were not necessarily the first-born of the several chief families in each tribe, just as to-day the Arab sheik claims authority by reason of priority of birth. The same phenomenon was true respecting the Midianites and other neighbor ing tribes (Num. xxxii. 4, 7; Josh. ix. 11). There must have been hundreds of them in Israel when Moses chose the "seventy" to be the Na
tional Council. It is not stated that this number was composed of one from each of the fifty-eight families (Num. xxvi.), and one from each tribal chief family; and indeed the phraseology is against this idea (Deut. i. 15). The elders were sometimes judges, but not necessarily, for David put priests and Levites in this office; and in Deut. xxi. 6, the elders are expressly distinguished from judges. After the settlement in Canaan the elders constituted the governing body in every village, town, and city (Ruth iv. 2 sqq.), and the medium of business with another place (Dent. xix. 12). It was the elders who demand ed a king in the people's name (1 Sam. viii. 4 sqq.), and who chose him (2 Sam. iii. 17): they were also the natural companions and advisers of the king (1 Kings viii. 1; 2 Kings xxii. 1), and the best agents of the prophet in pro moting a revival of religion (Jer. xiv. 1). In the exile the elders kept up their authority; and on the return they sided with the priests, and next to the princes were the rulers ( Ez. x. 8, 14, 15). The great synagogue, according to tradition, was composed of priestly and civil elders. In our Lord's mouth the elders are the channel of tradition (Matt. xv. 2; Mark vii. 8, 5), which bound like fetters the pious Jews. FR. W. SCHULTZ.

**ELECT, ELECTION.** See Predestination.

**Elements, the materials used in the sacra ments: water in baptism, bread and wine in the Lord's Supper.** See Baptism; Eucharist.

**ELLETHOPOLIS,** a city of Southern Pales tine, and the seat of a bishop, received its name, "Free City," from Alexander Severus (203), and was a place of importance in the days of Euse bius and Jerome. In 796 it was razed to the ground by the Saracens, and its Greek name was replaced by the Italian Apeiro. In the twelfth century the crusaders built a fortress.
on the spot, which was taken by Saladin, and
retaken by Richard. At present the site is occu-

cpied by an insignificant village (Beit Jibrin),

and covered with ruins. See Robinson: Biblical
Researches, New York, 1841.

ELEUTHERUS, a river of Syria, mentioned
1 Mac. xi. 7, xii. 30, the modern 'Aisheh el-Kebir,

rises at the north-eastern base of the Lebanon,

and enters the Mediterranean about eighteen
miles north of Tripolis.

ELEUTHERUS, Bishop of Rome 177-193; was
a Greek by birth. Two events are noticed during
his administration: first, the churches of Lyons
and Vienne sent Trenzen (then a presbyter, after-
wards bishop) to Rome to present to Eleutherus
the acta martyrum from the persecutions from
which the churches had just suffered (Eusebius, Hist.
Ecc., V. 4); next, the British king, Lucius,

wrote to Eleutherus (according to Beda, Hist.
Ecc., III. 104, 107) and told him that he was ready to accept Christianity as
soon as Eleutherus would send them teachers.

The latter notice is a little suspicious; as, towards
the close of the sixth century, Augustine found
in Britain a Christianity quite different from the
Romish type, while Beda was naturally anxious
to catch any hint at an early connection between
Britain and Rome.

ELEVEN. See Mass.

ELI (אֵל, “eligion”), a descendant of Ithamar,

and high priest. The proof of the first statement
is this: Abiathar was a lineal descendant of Eli
(cf. 1 Kings ii. 27; 1 Sam. ii. 31, 35); but his son
Ahimelech is expressly stated to have been “of
the sons of Ithamar” (1 Chron. xxiv. 3). The sins
of his two sons, Hophni and Phinehas, brought
sorrow upon his head, and entailed the destruc-
tion of his house. Samuel disclosed to him these
judgments (1 Sam. iii. 13, 14). He judged Israel
forty years (1 Sam. iv. 18). At the news of the
defeat of the Israelitish army he fell backward
and broke his neck. He had grown dim of sight,
and was ninety-eight at the time of his death
(1 Sam. v. 1). He was laid in the house of the
sons of Ithamar (1 Chron. xxiv. 3). The sins
of Abiathar were forgiven him by Solomon (1 Kings v. 1). And so Eleasor
or, more properly, Elihu ben
Asher Hallovi, acquired at reputation in the
first half of the sixteenth century, both in Italy
and Germany, as a teacher of Hebrew. Reuchlin,
Felician, and Luther had learned their Hebrew
from a Gallo-Roman, not Frankish family, and
was apprenticed to the goldsmith Abbo, at Li-
moges, the mint-master of the king of Aquitania.

In 610 he went to Paris, the residence of the king
of Neustria; got work in the royal treasury;
acquired the particular favor of King Clotaire,
and accumulated a fortune. Meanwhile, the in-
fluence of Columban reached the Neustrian court
from Burgundy and Austrasia, and obtained ab-
solute sway over Eligius and his young friend
Audoenus, at that time page to the king. Without
abandoning his trade, Eligius began an ascetic
life; and he soon earned a great reputation, not
only as an artist, but also for his piety. In 628
Clopin said, and was preceded by his son
Dagobert; but this change only increased the
influence of Eligius stronger at the Neustrian court, though
he was opposed by the Frankish chieftains and
courtiers, headed by the major domus. Young
Saxons were then brought to Paris, often in great
numbers, and sold there as slaves. He bought
them by the hundreds, and gave them freedom,
either sending them home or making them monks.
Monasteries and churches he founded, built,
adorned, and supported in the most lavish man-
er. The Monastery of Solignac, near Limoges,
was one of his foundations; the great nunnery in
Paris, another. Even on the the greatest
of clerics, he is said to have exercised a decisive
influence. But in 638 Dagobert died, and Herch-
envald, the major domus who governed the realm
during the minority of Clodwig II., wished to have
Eligius removed from the court. In 640 he was
made Bishop of Noyon, at the same time as his
friend Audoenus was made Bishop of Rouen.

As a bishop he was very amuse and active, re-
forming not only the chapter of his cathedral and
the monasteries of his dioceses, but also the courts
of the Frankish chieftains, whose wild drinking-
boots and fighting-feasts were a scandal to him.
In the synod of Chalon (641) he effected the
ELIJAH.

ELIJAH (עַלְיָה, or עָלִיָּה, "My God is Jehovah;" I.XXX. 18; New Testament [West. and Hort] Ηλίας), the greatest of the prophets belonging to the northern kingdom of Israel, and one of the grandest and most romantic characters in Hebrew history. The events of his life are recorded in four chapters of 1 Kings (xvii., xviii., xix., xxi.), in the first two chapters of 2 Kings, and in 2 Chron. xxi. 12-15. As in the case of Daniel, and of a majority of the twelve minor prophets, nothing is known of his parentage. Six times in the course of the narrative, including a later reference (2 Kings ix. 36), he is called "the Tishbite," which indicates his birthplace. This cannot have been the Tishbat of Gilead, "somewhere in this wild but fertile and picturesque district, though no relic of the name has as yet been discovered.

We have no account of the early life of the prophet, nor is it certain at what time exactly his translation occurred. From the narrative in Kings it might be supposed to have occurred in the reign of Ahabiah, king of Israel (887-886 B.C.), the immediate successor of Ahab. But if the "writing" spoken of in 2 Chron. xxii. 12 was a personal letter from Elijah to Jehoram, king of Judah (892-886 B.C.), Elisha must have communicated his public ministry before his master's death. The dramatic interest of the narrative is supplied only by that of the exodus from Egypt. Ahab, seventh of the nineteen kings of Israel, a weak man, who had married the Phoenician Jezebel, gave himself up also to the Phoenician idolatry, and the true religion was in imminent danger of being rooted out. Suddenly the apostate king is confronted by a rough-looking man from beyond the Jordan, described as a hairy man wearing a leathern girdle and a sheeplskin cape or mantle. It was Elijah the Tishbite, who had come as a prophet of Jehovah to tell the king there should be neither dew nor rain but according to his word. And then the prophet hastens back to Gilead. There, in the Wady Mareh, he snatches away a widow-woman who had been commanded to feed him till the brook dried up, and he is told to betake himself to the Phoenician Zarephath, where a widow-woman had been commanded to care for him, where he and the widow's family are fed miraculously, and the dead son of the widow is restored to life. Some years later, when drought and famine had become so wretched intolerable, he meets Ahab again, calls down fire from heaven upon his altar on Carmel, and slays, with Ahab's consent, the four hundred and fifty prophets of Baal, reddening the Kishon with their blood. Then he prayed for rain; and then he ran before the chariot of the apparently repentant Ahab, sixteen miles across the plain of Edronelon, to the entrance of Jezreel. But the rage of Jezebel drives him to Beersheba, and into the desert south of it, where he sinks down discouraged, praying for death. Thence he goes on to Shela, center of Judah, where he has had wonderful visions of God, which revive his faith and courage. Some six years later he appears again to denounce both Ahab and Jezebel for what they had done to Naboth, causing him to be put to death on a false charge of blasphemy, that they might seize his vineyard. His last personal appearance was to Ahaziah, son of Ahab and Jezebel, some three or four years after the Naboth tragedy. Elijah's life was thus one of bold, sudden appearances and disappearances in a gallant struggle against the mad idolatry that was working the ruin of the northern kingdom. Where he was, and what he was doing, during the long intervals of his public ministry, we can only conjecture. Some of his departure out of life was in keeping with the whole previous tenor of his life. His sheeplskin mantle, rolled up into a rod, smoked a path for himself and for Elisha across the Jordan. A chariot of fire, and horses of fire, parted the two prophets, and the Tishbite went up in a whirling whirlwind. This, however, does not quite end his biography. Second only to Moses, who, also, was strangely snatched away not far from the same locality, Moses and Elijah came back together to meet our Lord transfigured on Hermon. The abundance and boldness of the miracles ascribed to Elijah bring no suspicion upon the narrative,
when it is considered that the true religion was in such desperate straits. Elijah has been canonized in both the Greek and the Latin churches, the twentieth day of July being sacred to his memory. The literature of the subject is abundant. We mention only FRISCHMUTH, in the Critici Sacri; CAMARTUB: Elias Thesbiles, Paris, 1631; EWALD: Geschichte des Volkes Israel (III. 523 sqq., 573 sqq.); STANLEY: History of the Jewish Church (II. 321 sqq.); MILMAN: History of the Jews, I. 389 sqq.; F. W. KRIICMACHER: Elias der Thasbiter, Elberfeld, 1828, 6th ed., Coln, 1574, translated and published in several editions in England and America, e.g., eighth thousand, Cheltenham (Eng.), 1838, N.Y. (American Tract Society), 1838; W. M. TAYLOR: Elijah the Prophet, 1875; also "Eli," by v. ORELLI, in Herzog.

ELIM (strong trees), the second station of Israel after crossing the Red Sea (Exod. xv. 27; Num. xxxiii. 9). As the place had twelve springs and seventy palm-trees, and no alteration is likely to have taken place in the desert since that time, Elim is with most probability identified with Wady Gharandel; though some it is placed a little more to the south, at Wady L'seit, or Wady Taiyibeh. See SCHAFF: Through Bible Lands, pp. 152, 164.

ELIOT, John, "The Apostle to the Indians" (1604-90), was a native of Nasing, Essex County, Eng. Of his childhood and youth but little is known, except that he was blessed with eminently godly parents, by whom, to use his own language, his "first years were seasoned with the fear of God, the Word, and prayer." He was educated at the University of Cambridge, where his superior attainments, especially in the knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek languages, marked him out already for the great work to which in the New World his life was to be consecrated. Upon leaving the university, he became an usher in the grammar-school of the Rev. Thomas Hooker, at Little Baddow, near Chelmsford in Essex. Mr. Hooker had been silenced for nonconformity. He afterwards emigrated to New England, and is known in history as the father of the Connecticut churches. Eliot's connection with this admirable man formed a turning-point in his spiritual history. "When I came to this blessed family," said he, "I then saw, and never before, the power of godliness in its lively vigor and efficacy." He resolved to devote himself to the ministry of the gospel; and as his nonconformist principles exposed him to the tyranny of Laud, he sought the shores of America, arriving at Boston in 1631. In November, 1632, he was settled as teacher of the church of Christ in Roxbury, and continued in that office until his death,—a period of nearly sixty years. He married also in the same year. In 1639 he was appointed, with his colleague Mr. Welde, and Richard Mather of Dorchester, to manage a new version of the Psalms. This version, printed in the following year, and was called The Bay Psalm Book, but is now best known as The New-England Version of the Psalms. It was the first book printed in North America.

Soon after his settlement at Roxbury, Eliot became deeply interested in the Indians, and at length resolved to preach the gospel to them. There were some twenty tribes within the limits of the Colonies, but they spoke substantially the same language. Having acquired a competent knowledge of it, he met for the first time an assembly of Indians at Nonantum, in the present town of Newton, Oct. 28, 1646, and opened to them the way of salvation. He thus entered upon that career of missionary zeal and labors which has rendered his name so illustrious throughout Christendom. He was violently opposed by the sachems and powwows, or juggling priests; but, nothing daunted, he prosecuted his mission with apostolic energy, until villages of praying Indians began to appear in different parts of the Colony. In 1660, at Natick, the first Indian church was organized. Eliot tried also, though with only partial success, to civilize as well as convert the Indians. In process of time he came to be regarded by them as their best friend. His influence over them was extraordinary; and he exerted it for their good, in things temporal and spiritual alike, with rare wisdom and sagacity. The story of his missionary tours among the different tribes is full of interest. In 1661 he had the joy of publishing the New Testament in the Indian language, and three years later the whole Bible. Richard Baxter said of a copy of it sent to Charles II., "Such a work and fruit of a plantation was never before presented unto a king." Of this Bible Cotton Mather wrote: "Behold, ye Americans, the greatest honor that ever ye were partakers of,—the Bible printed here at our Cambridge; and it is the only Bible that ever was printed in all America, from the very foundation of the world." Eliot's Indian Bible is the grandest monument of early American scholarship and evangelism. The longest word in it is in Mark i. 40, Wutanpeitukquusunnooheshtunkwuh ("kneeling down to him"). Eliot also translated into the Indian tongue a catechism, Baxter's Call to the Uncounterted, and various other treatises on practical religion, besides preparing an Indian grammar. At the end of the latter he wrote, "Prayer and pains, through faith in Christ Jesus, will do any thing." In his last years, when weighed down by bodily infirmities, and unable any longer to preach, or to visit the Indians, he induced several families to send their negro servants to him once a week, that he might instruct them in the truths of the gospel. His old age was adorned with the simplicity and artlessness of a little child, with wonderful humility, and a charity that never failed. Nor was he wanting in fine touches of humor. He pretended to fear that his old friends and neighbors, Cotton and his family, had forgotten him. After the death of Cotton Mather of Dorchester, who had gone to heaven many years before, would suspect him to have gone the wrong way, because he staid so long behind them. His missionary work excited great interest in England; and the funds for carrying it on were chiefly supplied by the Society for Propagating the Gospel, set up in England. This corporation, instituted in 1649 by an ordinance of the famous Long Parliament, largely aided him also in defraying the expense of publishing the first and second editions of his Indian Bible. Mr. Eliot died on the 20th of May, 1690, in the eighty-sixth year of his age. His wife, a woman
ELISÆUS.

of uncommon excellence, and singularly adapted to be his companion and helper, passed on to the better country three years before him, in the eighty-fourth year of his age. "They had like children,—a daughter and five sons. Four of the sons were graduated at Harvard College, and three of them became ministers of the gospel. Only the daughter and one son survived their father.

A worthier or more venerable name than that of John Eliot is to be found in all the annals of New England. "There was no man on earth whom I honored above him," wrote Richard Baxter. Southey pronounced him "one of the most extraordinary men of any country." Even in his own day he was called "The Apostle to the Indians," by Convers Francis, vol. V. of Sparks's Library of American Biography (Boston, 1836).

GEORGE L. PRENTISS.

ELISÆUS (Armenian Egishé), an eminent Armenian historian and theologian of the fifth century; was educated by Sahak and Mesrob, and served as secretary to the Armenian prince Vartan during the rebellion against Yazgedr II., the Persian king, who threatened the existence of Christianity in Armenia. Elisæus was afterwards made Bishop of Amatunik, and was as much present at the great national synod of Ardashad, 446. He died 480 at Reschdonni, on the southern shore of Lake Van. It is a history of the Persian persecution of Christi

anity in Armenia, which he narrates as an eye

ness in kind of the activity of the two prophets.

LIT.—In addition to his Indian Bible, grammar, etc., Eliot published various other works, among them, The Harmony of the Gospels, The Divine Management of Gospel Churches by the Ordinance of Councils, The Christian Commonwealth, also several letters and other writings relating to the progress of the gospel among the Indians. The best account of him and his missionary labors is Life of John Eliot, the Apostle to the Indians, by Convers Francis, vol. V. of Sparks's Library of American Biography (Boston, 1836).

ELISEUS (Armenian Egishé), an eminent

and the home. He was often seen in the vicinity of Jericho, and on the Jordan, at Gilgal and at Bethel, and owned a house at Samaria. He is the friend of the poor and needy, who interested himself in the smallest details of domestic life.

Now he heals the impure waters with salt (2 Kings ii. 19-22), now he makes the penurious fare of the sons of the prophets palatable (iv. 38-41). He helps the widow out of debt (iv. 1-7), and restores to a poor boy the axe which he had fallen into the water (vi. 1-7). A few loaves through his blessing suffice for a hundred (iv. 42-44). To his hospitable Shunammite friend he promises a child (iv. 8-17), and, when it has died, restores it to life (viii. 1-6). His fame extended to Syria; and Naaman the captain, by his counsel, bathes in the Jordan, and loses his leprosy (vii. 1-9).

But Elisha's gracious activity was not confined to cases in private life. King Joram applies to him for counsel in his distress (iii. 11-20). His prediction of the Syrian attacks is so accurate, that the Syrian commander attributes his defeats to a traitor in the camp (vi. 11); and, when he seeks to take the prophet captive, Elisha leads him and his army to Samaria, as though they had been stricken with blindness (vi. 18-19). Elisha was obliged to follow the divine direction, and, against his will, and with tears, predicted before Hazael that he would come to the throne, and would ravage Israel (viii. 7-15). He had constantly before his mind the well-being of his people, as is evidenced by the unceasing esteem of the nation, and the testimony of a king at his death, who called him his father, and Israel's "chariot and horsemen." (xiii. 14).

In sublime intellectual power Elisha was not equal to his predecessor; but in him the grace of God shows its tender and solicitous care for the smallest events. His miracles approach nearest to those of the Saviour, in which the fulness of divine grace revealed itself. He who sees deeds of supernatural power in the saving life of Christ will not deny them to his type in the Old Testament.

LIT.—See the Bible histories by Ewald, Hengstenberg, (and especially Stanley, H. C. pp. 338-364), and the articles in the Bible dictionaries [especially in Smith]. V. ORELL.

ELIZABETH, ST., of Hungary, the daughter of Andreas II., King of Hungary; b. in Pressburg, 1207; d. at Marburg, Nov. 19, 1281. In her fourth year she was betrothed to Ludwig, son of Hermann, Landgrave of Thuringia, to whose court she was at once sent in a silver cradle. The Warburg, the residence of the landgrave, was at that time one of the most brilliant courts in Germany. The marriage was perfected in 1221, Ludwig having succeeded his father in 1216. It proved to be a happy one. Both were of serious temperaments, and under their administration the tone of life rose high at the Warburg. Elizabeth displayed in an ever increasing measure the virtues of humility, mercy, and charity. She was the friend of the afflicted, in person relieved the sufferings of the sick, and distributed large sums among the needy; and in the famine of 1226 her charity relieved the poor from far and near. She founded a hospital
at Eisenach for twenty-four persons enfeebled by age, or rendered helpless by disease. The even tenor of this life of marital felicity and charitable effort was interrupted by the death of Ludwig in 1227, in Apulia, on the eve of departure on a crusade with Frederick II. Beautiful and bright as her life had heretofore been, it henceforth becomes a melancholy and pietistic mortification, which the religious sentiment of the time commended and praised as the best evidence and most perfect fruit of piety, but which the more evangelical spirit of modern Christianity condemns as unnatural and barbarous.

While her husband was still living, and with his consent, Elizabeth had made Conrad of Marburg, the papal inquisitor-general in Germany, her confessor and religious guide. Under his influence she gave herself up to an ascetic discipline, undergoing severe castigations at the hands of her attendants. Conrad endeavored to separate her from her husband, but only succeeded in extracting a promise, that, in the event of his death, she would not marry again. After Ludwig's demise, she submitted herself slavishly to this iron-hearted priest. She received harsh treatment from Heinrich Raspe, her brother-in-law, who had usurped the throne, and was driven forth from the Wartburg. After much suffering she found refuge with her uncle Egbert, Bishop of Bamberg. The knights who brought back her husband's remains, sought and secured justice for Elizabeth. She was invited back to the Wartburg, but at her own request was sent to Marburg, where she ended her days. After occupying for a while a dilapidated cottage, she entered a convent, but did not become a nun. She was wholly under the withering influence of Conrad, who set himself to the task of destroying every natural affection, however pure, in the hope of making a saint. Elizabeth submitted to the most menial services, separated herself from her three children, and bare her back while brother Gerhard flagellated it, and Conrad sang the Misereor as an accompaniment. From this painful and ghastly spectacle, which was, however, to according with the morbid and mystic religious ideas of the day, they turned away with relief, and think only of the Christian humility and tender charity of character which underlay this asceticism. In Marburg, as in the bright days on the Wartburg, she labored to relieve the wants of the sick and poor. A hospital which still stands attests her munificence. She was canonized by Gregory IX. in 1235; and the same year the Landgrave Ludwig laid in Marburg the comer-stone of the stately Elizabeth Church.

While her husband was still living, and with his consent, Elizabeth had made Conrad of Marburg, the papal inquisitor-general in Germany, her confessor and religious guide. Under his influence she gave herself up to an ascetic discipline, undergoing severe castigations at the hands of her attendants. Conrad endeavored to separate her from her husband, but only succeeded in extracting a promise, that, in the event of his death, she would not marry again. After Ludwig's demise, she submitted herself slavishly to this iron-hearted priest. She received harsh treatment from Heinrich Raspe, her brother-in-law, who had usurped the throne, and was driven forth from the Wartburg. After much suffering she found refuge with her uncle Egbert, Bishop of Bamberg. The knights who brought back her husband's remains, sought and secured justice for Elizabeth. She was invited back to the Wartburg, but at her own request was sent to Marburg, where she ended her days. After occupying for a while a dilapidated cottage, she entered a convent, but did not become a nun. She was wholly under the withering influence of Conrad, who set himself to the task of destroying every natural affection, however pure, in the hope of making a saint. Elizabeth submitted to the most menial services, separated herself from her three children, and bare her back while brother Gerhard flagellated it, and Conrad sang the Misereor as an accompaniment. From this painful and ghastly spectacle, which was, however, to according with the morbid and mystic religious ideas of the day, they turned away with relief, and think only of the Christian humility and tender charity of character which underlay this asceticism. In Marburg, as in the bright days on the Wartburg, she labored to relieve the wants of the sick and poor. A hospital which still stands attests her munificence. She was canonized by Gregory IX. in 1235; and the same year the Landgrave Ludwig laid in Marburg the corner-stone of the stately Elizabeth Church.

ELIZABETH ALBERTINE, 717 ELKESAITES.

ELIZABETH ALBERTINE, countess-palatine, b. at Heidelberg, Dec. 26, 1618; d. at Herford, in Westphalia, Feb. 11, 1680; was a daughter of Friedrich V., elector of the Palatinate, and king of Bohemia, and Elizabeth Stuart, a daughter of James I. She was educated at the Hague, where her parents kept a quiet court. She learned six languages. Descartes was her teacher in mathematics. Malebranche and Leibnitz were among her friends and correspondents. She early decided to remain unmarried, and devote her life to philosophy; and the decapiation of her uncle, Charles I. (1648), and the unhappy marriage of her brother, Karl Ludwig of the Palatinate, etc., only confirmed her decision. In 1667 she retired to Herford in Westphalia as abbess; and there she had opportunity to show hospitality to the followers of Labadie in 1670, and to the Quakers in 1676; circumstances which, towards the close of her life, gave her mind a more decidedly religious turn. Biographies of her have been written by Gürber, in Rümmer's hist. Taschenbuch (1851), and by GORBEL, in his Geschichte d. christ. Lebens, etc., Coblenz, 1855, vol. II. M. GORBEL.

ELKESAITES, a school in the Jewish Christian Church, whose doctrines were tinged with Gnosticism. Our principal sources of information are the Philosophumena of Hippolytus and Epiphanius, who also calls them Sampassoi (from σαμπασσοί, "sun"). The derivation of the name has led to many conjectures. Delitzsch derives it from a Galilean village (Elkesi); others, from a Hebrew word meaning a spectacle; while the church fathers derive it from a pretended founder, Elxsai. It was probably merely the designation of a book. At any rate, the Elkesaites had in their possession a book which was widely used, and, according to St. Clement, Origen, believed to have fallen from heaven, or, according to the more accurate philosophers, was revealed by the Son of God himself. Elxsai is reported to have received it in Parthia in Trajan's reign, and to have presented it to the Sobhai (Epiphan., xix. 1; Philos., ix. 18). The work itself contains a large element of apocalyptic religion mingled with Judaistic and Christian ideas. It authorizes the practice of astrology and magic. Besides those features which Elkesaitism had in common with Ebionism may be mentioned the doctrine that baptism washes away sins; and the frequent repetition of the rite is enjoined. Before the Philosophumena were discovered (1851), the Elkesaites were identified with the Ebionites (Gieseler), and the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies were regarded as the main authority on the subject. But the two works differ; the Philosophumena teaching an intensive and acute form of Ebionism, the Clementines a modified type, giving up circumcision. The book of Elxsai was widely circulated, but cannot be regarded as the confession of Ebionism. The Elkesaites were not a distinct sect, but rather a school scattered among all parties of the Judeo-Christian Church.


G. UHLBORN.
ELLER, Elias, b. at Ronsdorf in the duchy of Berg, 1890; d. there May 16, 1750; married at Elberfeld a rich widow (Bolckhaus), and established himself at the head of a sect of apocalyptic millenarians, called "Ellerians," or "Ronsdorfer," who received their revelations through a young baker-daughter from Elberfeld (Buchel), whom Eller married after the death of his first wife. The Bible the sect accepted as the word of God: but it needed various kinds of supplements; and these were given by Buchel, in the Hirten-tasche ("shepherd's bag"). Abraham, Moses, and Elijah were only prototypes of Eller, in whom the whole fulness of divinity dwelt. The Messiah was to be born again by Buchel, etc. When investigations were had at Elberfeld concerning the meetings of the sect, Eller moved (in 1737), with all his followers, to Ronsdorf, where a church was to be built, and a minister was appointed (Schleiermacher). After the death of his second wife, Eller married another rich widow (Bosselmann); and the sect, though suspected of immoralities, began to spread, when disagreement broke out between Eller and Schleiermacher. Schleiermacher was expelled, and fled to Holland, formally accused by Eller of sorcery. Wülffing was appointed minister in his place. After the death of Eller, Wülffing and Bolckhaus (a son of Eller's first wife) tried to propagate the sect; but it soon after died out. Full accounts of it are found in the writings of J. W. Kneve, (the defender of Schleiermacher), P. Wülffing, and J. Bolckhaus. See J. A. Engelk: Geschichte der religiösen Schleiermáerei im Herzogthum Berg, Schwelm, 1829. G. H. KIPPEL.

ELLIS, William, missionary, b. in London, County Donegal, Ireland, May 16, 1792; d. at Mount Pleasant, Io., Jan. 6, 1869. He was licensed as a local Methodist preacher 1813, and in 1815 emigrated to America. He served in various capacities, having been superintendent of the mission among the Wyandotte Indians at Upper Sandusky, a presiding elder of the Ohio district, professor of languages in Madison College, Uniontown, Penn., and for many years editor of different Methodist religious papers. From 1857 to 1860 he was professor of biblical literature, and president of the Iowa Wesleyan University, and again from 1864 to 1867. His general reputation rests upon his Delineation of Roman Catholicism, N.Y., 1841, 2 vols. London, 1851 (with full index); but he also wrote The Great Secession (a history of the division of the Methodist-Episcopal Church in 1844 on account of slavery), N.Y., 1852; and South-western Methodism, a History of the M. E. Church in Missouri from 1834 to 1864, N.Y., 1868.

ELLIS, William, missionary, b. in London, Aug. 29, 1794; d. at Hอดdesdon, Hertfordshire, June 25, 1872. He was sent by the London Missionary Society to the South Sea Islands in 1816, and labored there until 1823, when he removed to Hawaii, and rendered efficient service to the American Board in reducing the Hawaiian language to a written form. See SANDWICH ISLANDS. The state of Mrs. Ellis's health compelled his return to England in 1825. He entered into the home-work of the society, at first as travelling agent, but from 1832 to 1839 as foreign secretary. In 1839 he published the Martyr Church of Madagascar; in 1844, the first volume of a history of the London Missionary Society. Circumstances prevented the completion of the work. In 1850 he was sent out to Madagascar to revive the mission there, which had suffered so terribly from persecution. By his tact and zeal he succeeded in putting Christianity upon a firm basis. Between 1853 and 1863 he visited the island four times; and he has published his experiences and information in Three Visits to Madagascar (London, 1855), Madagascar Recalled (London, 1807).

Mr. Ellis was one of those missionaries who have laid the church and the world under tribute. He was not only indefatigable in labor, and solicitous for the spiritual welfare of his converts and their brethren, but he was also able to improve their temporal condition by his practical knowledge. In his boyhood he had worked enthusiastically at market-gardening; and, in the year before he sailed on his first missionary journey, he learned not only theology, but printing and book-binding. He was able, therefore, to acclimatize and improve the crops in the South Sea Islands, which have been a source of revenue to the inhabitants, and also to set up the first printing-press in Polynesia. His books are not merely faithful and interesting records of missionary labor, but contributions to science.

ELWOOD, Thomas, a Quaker, the suggester of Paradise Regained; b. at Crowell, Oxfordshire, 1639; d. at Hunger Hill, near Amdeean, Buckinghamshire, March 1, 1713. He was Latin reader to Milton for some months. During the Great Plague in London (1665) he took a house for Milton at Giles Chalout; and there he read the manuscript of Paradise Lost, which he returned with the remark, "Thou hast said much here of Paradise lost; but what hast thou to say of Paradise found?" To Ellwood we are indebted for much information in regard to Milton and the persecutions of the Quakers. Of his own works the most important are, Forcery no Christianity (London, 1682), and his Autobiography, with supplement by Joseph Wyeth (1714), reprint, Boston, 1877, in the Choice Autobiographies series, edited by W. D. Howells.

ELOHIM (אֱלֹהִים), the term most frequently used in the Old Testament for God. It is the plural form, the singular, Eloah (אֵלֹה), being exclusively used in poetry. The ancient Semitic name for God, El (אל), occurs seldom. It defines God, beyond dispute, as having absolute power. So in Assyrian alú means "powerful." But Eloah cannot be proved to mean "powerful." The verb means in the Arabic "to be afraid," and (according to Oehler) is connected with the Assyrian alú, so that it would mean power which inspires fear. Elohim, as the designation of the true God, is not used in any of the Semitic languages except biblical Hebrew. Various explanations have been given of this plural form. The old theologians, beginning with Peter Lombard, found a reference to the Trinity; and, by pointing to the inexhaustible fulness of the Deity, it is, so say the least, inconsistent with an abstract monotheism. A second view sees in the plural form a relic of an ancient polytheism; but the opinion is
**ELOTH.**

*See* E'LATH.

**ELY** (Ely), a town of Spain which has now dis-appeared, which was previously situated near Granada. A council (Concilium Elbizianarum, or Illibizianarum) was held there in 305 or 306, according to Hefele (in the spring of 306, according to Dale, not 324, as in some copies of the acts), and attended by nineteen bishops, among whom was Hosius of Corduba, and a number of priests. Its canons refer exclusively to discipline, prohibiting unchastity, clerical marriages, pictures in churches, lights by day in cemeteries, etc. See **MANSI, II.**; **HEFELLE: Concilien geschichte, i. § 13; D ALE: The Synod of Elyria, London, 1892.**

**ELY** (Ely), the see of an English bishopric, is a town on the Isle of Ely, near the Ouse, sixteen miles north-north-east of Cambridge. A monastery was founded there by Etheldreda, Queen of Northumbria (673), of which she died abbess (679); but, when the town was ravaged by the Danes (870), it was burnt. Ethelwold, Bishop of Winchester, rebuilt it in 970, and placed in it monks, instead of nuns. In 1083 the Abbot Simeon commenced the conventual church, which was converted by Henry VIII. into a cathedral. The see of Ely was founded 1107. The cathedral is of mixed architecture, but very imposing. It has been restored at an expense of more than seventy thousand pounds. The bishop is paid fifty-five hundred pounds yearly. The present incumbent (1882) is Dr. James Russell Woodford. See Whitaker's *Almanack for 1885,* p. 199.

**EMANATION** denotes a theory of the relation between God and the universe, according to which the world was not created by a divine * fiat,* but developed through various stages, and by an involuntary outflow of the divine substance, gradually deteriorating, and at last ending in mere matter. In a vague and confused form this theory may be found in most Oriental religions; but it owes its elaborate and systematic form to the Neo-Platonists, from whom it was borrowed by the Gnostics. Its scientific value was absolutely null; but teaching people, as it did, to raise themselves above their natural state, and strive towards the divine, it has had some moral influence.

**EMBALMING** is an art peculiar to the Egyptians, not practised by the Hebrews, and is mentioned in the Bible only in the cases of Jacob and Joseph (Gen. i. 4, 28), both of whom died in Egypt, and were afterwards transferred to Canaan; the former immediately after his death, the latter not until after the lapse of centuries (Exod. xiii. 19; Josh. xxiv. 32). According to Herodotus (II., 86), the Egyptians knew three different methods of embalming. After the first, which cost about one talent of silver, the brain was removed through the nostrils, and replaced with drugs. An opening was then put in the left flank, and the intestines taken out by the hand, placed in a peculiar vessel, and thrown into the river. The cavity was rinsed with palmwine, and filled with aromatic herbs, after which the opening in the flank was again closed by being sewn up. The corpse thus prepared was then steeped for seventy days in "natron" (according to a recent analysis, sub-carbonate of soda), and swathed in linen bandages smeared with gum. The mummy was finally laid in a coffin of sycamore-wood, which was placed vertically in the tomb. After the second method the intestines were not removed by hand, but by means of cedar-oil, which, introduced into the body, dissolved them. The corpse was then steeped, as usually, in natron. After the third method, the corpse was only rinsed internally by an infusion, and then steeped. The embalming of Jacob's corpse took only forty days: but it appears, from the mummies preserved at Memphis, that a method of embalming was employed there, less complete and less careful than that employed at Thebais. In the Christian Church embalming seems to have been used now and then with martyrs and saints, as intimated by Tertullian (Apol., 42); or perhaps this was only an adaptation of the Jewish custom of filling the grave with myrrh and spices (2 Chron. xvi. 14; John xix. 39). See **WILKINSON: Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egypt:** London, 1837-41, re-edited by S. Birch, London, 1875; **Maspero:** *Mémoire sur quelques papyrus du Louvre; le ritual de l'emballement.*

**EMBER DAYS** are the first Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday after the first Sunday in Lent, after Whitsunday, after the 14th of September, and after the 13th of December, which were fixed by the council of Placentia, 1085. Their name is in Latin, *Jejuna Quatuor Temporum;* in French, *Quatre-Temps;* in German, *Quatember;* in Danish, *Tamperdag,* which seems to indicate pretty plainly the derivation of the English name, though another has been attempted, from the Anglo-Saxon *Ymbreu,* "a circuit." In the ancient church they were solemnized with fasting, and prayers for God's blessing on the seasons ushered in by them. Afterwards they were fixed by the Roman and the Anglican Church as fit periods for ecclesiastical ordinations.

**EMBURY, Philip,** the first Methodist minister in America; b. in Ballygarvan, Ireland, Sept. 21, 1729; d. at Camden, Washington County, N.Y., Aug. 1775. He emigrated to America 1760. He was a carpenter by trade, and had been a preacher in Ireland. He settled first in New York City, but did not preach until 1768, when he acted on the advice of Barbara Heck. The first services were in his own house; but in 1767 the famous "Rigging Loft" was the place of meeting, and there Methodism in New York may be
said to have been born. In 1708 the first Methodist chapel was built, on the site of the present John-street Church; and upon it he worked as a carpenter. In 1709 the first missionaries sent out by Wesley came to the city, which then had a population of only twenty thousand; and Embury resigned his charge, and went to Camden, near which place (at Ashgrove) he organized a society, and continued his joint work of carpenter and preacher. His remains were thrice interred,—in Camden, Ashgrove, and finally, by order of the Troy Conference, in Woodland Cemetery, Cambridge, N.Y.

EMMONS, Nathanael, D.D., b. at Hollis, N.H., Aug. 18, 1757; d. at Rockford, Ill., May 26, 1803. He was graduated at Yale College 1811, and at Andover Seminary 1814, and was professor of ecclesiastical history and pastoral theology in that seminary from 1829 to 1854. Besides a life of his brother, Rev. Joseph Emerson, he translated and annotated the first volume of Wigger's Augustinianism and Pelagianism (Andover, 1840), and contributed to various periodicals.

EMMAUS (Hebrew Khummah, "hot spring"), the source, "threescore stades (seven miles and a half), from Jerusalem, where Christ revealed himself to the two disciples on the day of his resurrection (Luke xxiv. 13). Its site has not yet been satisfactorily determined, although many attempts have been made. It has been identified with (1) Annoa, the Emmaus-Nicopolis mentioned in 1 Mac. iii. 40, 57, ix. 50, where Judas conquered the Greeks. So an old tradition supported by Eusebius and Jerome. The conclusive arguments against this view are that Emmaus-Nicopolis was not sixty, but a hundred and sixty, stadia from Jerusalem, and was not a small village, but a town of some importance. (2) Kubebe, seven miles north-west of Jerusalem, the last halting-place before reaching that city, in the beautiful Wady Be'it Channin. Supported by tradition dating back to the twelfth century, the time of the crusades. So Robinson. See H. ZSCHOKKEI Das neuleslamentliche Emmaus. See also Coll. Antiqua III.; and Pertz: Momms., VI. It has proved very difficult, however, to lay bare the historical kernel of the Emmaus legend on account of its chronological absurdities; and it must be added that such a feat, even if it could be done, would probably hardly be worth doing.

EMMONS, Nathanael, D.D., b. April 20 (O.S.), 1745, in the parish of Millington, in the town of East Haddam, Conn. This town was also the birthplace of the missionary brothers, David and John Brainerd, of President Edward Dorr Griffin, and his brother George D. Griffin, Esq., of the jurist, Jeremiah Gates Brainerd, and the poet, James Brainerd Taylor. In 1763, at the age of eighteen, he entered Yale College. Here he was a classmate of John Trumbull, the author of McFingall; John Treadwell, governor of Connecticut; and Dr. Samuel Wales, professor of divinity in Yale College. These men and Emmons were the names of several of his contemporaries, who contained other eminent men, among them Rev. Dr. Joseph Lyman of Hatfield, Mass. A few months after his graduation, in 1767, he began his theological studies with Rev. Nathan Strong of Coventry, Conn., and finished them with Dr. John Smalley of Berlin, Conn. Smalley was a pupil of Bellamy, and Belamy of the elder Edwards. Through Smalley, Emmons gained a well-nigh personal acquaintance with the Bethlem and Northampton divines. In 1769 he was "approved" as a preacher, and on the 21st of April, 1773, was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in Franklin, Mass. He resigned his pastorate on the 28th of May, 1827. He had remained in the office fifty-four years. He died Sept. 23, 1840, in the sixty-eighth year of his ministry and the ninety-sixth year of his age. He retained his faculties to a surprising degree until his death. Few men have ever left the world with a more unfltering and solid faith in Christ. He enjoyed to the last the reverence of his parishioners and the highest esteem of the neighboring churches. He was an intimate friend of Dr. Hopkins of Newport, R.I., Dr. Hart of Preston, Conn., Dr. West of Stock-
bridge, Mass. He was a brother-in-law of Rev. Dr. Spring of Newburyport, Rev. Dr. Austin, president of Burlington College, Rev. Leonard Worcester, Rev. William Riddel. These four Hopkinsonian ministers married the daughters of Rev. Dr. Hopkinson of Hadley, who himself was not a Hopkinsonian.

Dr. Emmons published more than two hundred articles in various periodicals, such as The Massachusetts Missionary Magazine, The Connecticut Evangelical Magazine, The Utica Christian Repository, The Hopkinson Magazine, and The Christian Magazine. He also published numerous ordination and funeral sermons, which are not found in the collected editions of his works. The following are some of his more important publications: A Dissertation on the Scriptural Qualifications for Admission to the Christian Ministry (1815); Report of Dr. Emmons's Remarks on the same; A Memoir of Dr. Emmons. In 1850 a seventh volume of his sermons was published. In 1860 and 1861 a new collected edition of his works was published in Boston in six large octavo volumes; and to this edition was prefixed a Memoir containing 486 pages, by E. A. Park of Andover Theological Seminary.

The case of Dr. Emmons was a theological school. Not a private instructor in our land has educated so many young men as he for the Christian ministry: the number of them cannot be exactly ascertained, but was probably not less than a hundred. Among his pupils nine became presidents or professors of colleges or theological seminaries, fourteen had an important agency in establishing literary and charitable institutions, forty-six are noticed in the biographical dictionaries of eminent men.

Few ministers in the world have devoted themselves so earnestly, patiently, and methodically as Dr. Emmons to their professional work. He preached nearly or quite six thousand times, and spent ten, twelve, or fourteen hours every day in his study, with his pen or book in hand, for more than seventy years. He was temperate, even abstemious, in his diet, regular in his habits, and was a model of punctuality, self-consistency, perseverance in study. He combined a sprightly wit with a profound reverence for the truth. His style of thought was precise, definite, sharp. Dr. Leonard Woods of Andover said, "Emmons has one of the grandest understandings ever created." He was an original thinker, and formed his theological system with rare independence of mind. Although a man of study, rather than a "man of affairs," he entered with zeal into several public enterprises. He was one of the fathers of the Massachusetts Missionary Society, and for the first twelve years of its existence was its president. He was one of the original editors of The Massachusetts Missionary Magazine. When the Masonic fraternity was most popular, he was a pronounced anti-Mason.

When antislavery was most generally condemned, he was an active abolitionist. In politics he was an outspoken Federalist. His Jeroboam Sermon is a curiosity in politico-homiletical literature.

The theological system of Dr. Emmons is often confounded with that of Dr. Samuel Hopkins. The following statement of the two systems was given by Emmons himself, and will explain the difference, as well as the agreement, between the two.

The distinctive tenets of Hopkinsianism are:
1. All real holiness consists in disinterested benevolence; 2. All sin consists in selfishness; 3. There are no promises of regenerating grace made to the doings of the unregenerate; 4. The impotency of sinners with respect to believing in Christ is not natural, but moral; 5. A sinner is required to approve in his heart of the divine command and to do the thing he knows is right; 6. God has exerted his power in such a manner as he purposed would be followed by the existence of sin; 7. The introduction of moral evil into the universe is so overruled by God as to make it correspond with the system of the world; 8. Regeneration is the result of a change of heart, which God brings about before faith in Christ; 9. Though men became sinners by Adam, according to a divine constitution, yet they have and are accountable for no sins but personal; 10. Though believers are justified through Christ's righteousness, yet his righteousness is not transferred to them.

The distinctive tenets of Emmonism's system are:
1. Holiness and sin consist in free, voluntary exercises; 2. Men act freely under the divine agency; 3. The least transgression of the divine law deserves eternal punishment; 4. Right and wrong are founded in the nature of things; 5. God exercises mere grace in pardoning or justifying penitent believers through the atonement of Christ, and mere goodness in rewarding them for their good works; 6. Notwithstanding the total depravity of sinners, God has a right to require them to turn from sin to holiness; 7. Preachers of the gospel ought to exhort sinners to love God, repent of sin, and believe in Christ immediately; 8. Men are active, not passive, in regeneration. Dr. Emmons believed that these eight statements are involved in the system of Dr. Hopkins; that they are evolved from that system, rather than added to it. Still they characterize Emmonism as it is grafted upon Hopkinsianism.

EMORY, John, a Methodist-Episcopal bishop; b. in Queen Anne County, Maryland, April 11, 1759; d. in Reisterstown, Md., Dec. 16, 1856. From 1824 to 1855 he was bishop of the Episcopal Church at New York, during which time he paid off all the debts of the book concern, and put it in a far better position than ever before. He also founded the Methodist Quarterly Review; and nearly all the original articles in the first two volumes are from him. In 1832 he was elected president of Dickinson College. He wrote Defense of our Fathers, N.Y., 1824; The Episcopal Controversy Reviewed, N.Y., 1838. — Robert, son of preceding; b. in Philadelphia, July 29, 1814; d. in Baltimore, May 18, 1848. He was elected president of Dickinson College in 1845. He wrote Life of his father (N.Y., 1841), a History of the Discipline of the Methodist-Episcopal Church, N.Y., 1843 (in a
new edition brought down to 1864, and an un-
finished analysis of Butler's *Anatomy*, completed
by Dr. Crooks, N.Y., 1856.

**EMSER, Hieronymus**, b. at Ulm in March,
1757; d. at Dresden, Nov. 6, 1827; studied at
Tübingen and Basel, and received the degree of
Raymund of Petraniko as secretary on his tour of
visitation through Germany. Raymond was a
great collector of relics, and Emser's first work
was an essay on crosses said to have fallen down
from heaven. After lecturing on *humanitatis* at
Kufurt, where he had Luther among his hearers,
and editing the works of Picus of Mirandola, he
went to Leipzig, where he lectured on canon law,
and published some essays on the propriety of
toasting each other when drinking (1505), on the
improvement of wine, beer, and vinegar (1507),
etc., and an apotheosis of Bishop Benno, which
has been incorporated with the *Actia Sanctorum*.
In 1510 he was sent by Duke George of Saxony
to Rome to negotiate the canonization of Benno;
and on his return he received several rich benefi-
cies, and settled at Dresden, where Luther was
his guest in 1517. It was already then apparent,
however, that, if the case of the former had ever
become decidedly serious, Emser would not
be found on his side; and immediately after
the conference of Leipzig a rupture took place
between them, and a controversy began, of a
character by no means edifying, and without any
profit to the cause. Luther called him the he-
ghost of Dresden, with reference to his escutcheon,
and he called Luther the bull of Wittenberg:
that is about all which needs be said of the con-
troversy. The only one of Emser's polemical
writings which has any real worth, and has exer-
cised any real influence, is his *Annotationes us-
ber Luthers naw testament*. Many of his corrections
were adopted by Luther himself, and others were
afterwards introduced in Luther's translation by
others. A translation he himself made of the
New Testament after the Vulgate (1527) is com-
pletely worthless. See WALDA: *Nachricht von
Hieronymus Emser* in *Leipziger* Jahrg., 1783;
WEYERMANN: *Nachrichten von Gelehrten,
Künstlern, und andern merkwürdigen Personen aus
Ulm*, 1798. BERNHARD RIGGENBACH.

**EMS, Congress of (1786).** In the latter part
of the eighteenth century there prevailed among
the German prelates a general discontent with the
encroachments of the Pope upon the episcopal
authority. More than once complaints were
lodged with the emperor, and protection was
urgently demanded at every new imperial elec-
tion. Finally the establishment of a new nunci-
ature at Munich brought the archbishops of
Cologne, Mayence, Treves, and Salzburg to com-
bine in action. The papal nuncios had always by
the German prelates been considered a great in-
convenience; and the nunciation was, indeed, by
its very nature a limitation, if not an infringe-
ment, of the episcopal power. That just the above
four prelates should feel called upon to take hold
of the matter was only natural, and the Gallican
principles of episcopal independence which recently had been so vigorously expounded
by Honthemer, the suffragan Bishop of Treves, in
his famous work, *Justini Febronius Icti de statu
ecclesiae et legittima potestate Romani pontificis liber
singularius ad reunendum dissidentiae in ecclesia Chris-
tianos compositus*, 1763, and, in conformity with
these views, they had begun to reform both the
school and the church in their dioceses; but they
knew only too well from experience that such
reforms would meet with the most decided opposi-
tion from the papal nuncio. They were, moreover,
led to believe that they would receive vigorous aid from the emperor, Joseph II. When,
in October, 1786, they laid their complaints be-
fore him, he declared that he would recognize the
papal nuncios only as political agents, as emissa-
caries concerned with the general polity of the
church only; that he would tolerate no encroach-
ments upon the diocesan rights of the bishops
and archbishops, etc.; and he encouraged them
to openly resist any such attempt from the side
of the Pope. The four prelates consequently
made inquiries in Rome whether the new nuncio
at Munich was sent simply as an ambassador to
the Bavarian court, or whether he came intrusted
with papal powers; and, when it was answered
that the latter was the case, they remonstrated.

Nevertheless, the new nuncio, Zoglio, appeared
at Munich in May, 1786; and the nunciature of
Cologne, falling vacant shortly after, was im-
mediately filled by Paccia. The prelates then
took an energetic step: they sent representatives
to meet at Ems, and a minute investigation was
made of all the precepts of canon law concerning
the relation between the Pope and the bishops.
As the result of this investigation, an elaborate
exposition, the so-called Emser Punctuation, was
signed by the four prelates Aug. 25, 1786, and
sent at the same time to the Pope and the em-
peror, requesting that the actual relation between
the Pope and the bishops should be regulated
according to these precepts. The general hear-
ing of this exposition is, that the Pope shall
renounce all such rights and privileges and reser-
vations as did not belong to the papal primacy
during the first centuries of the Church, but were
derived from the Isidorean decreals. As these
decreals have been proved to be false, and are
now generally recognized as such, any power
based upon them must be considered an enun-
ciation of pretence. The whole relation between
the Pope and the bishops is defined in harmony with the
Febronian principles. The Pope is and must
always be the primate of the Church, the centre
and the point of unity; but the bishops, as the
successors of the apostles, have from Christ re-
ceived the power of the keys, the right to give
laws and to suspend them, etc. Any person liv-
ing in a diocese is subordinate to the bishop; no
recourse can be had to the Pope except through
the bishop; the office of the nuncio must be
abolished; dispensations cannot be granted by the
Pope; dispensations can be granted only by the
bishop; monastic orders in the diocese cannot be
governed by a general outside the diocese, etc.
In short, a theory of the Papacy is propounded
which involves the very cessation of the Papacy,
and which only existed in reality before the Pa-
pany itself ceased to exist. Since all other mis-
terial councils of the fifteenth century, such an
attack was never made upon the Papacy by digni-
taries of the Church.

In the controversy which now ensued, the Pope
took care not to touch the principal question,—
whether the conception of the Papacy set forth by
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the Punctation was right or wrong. His first step was to order the nuncios to continue their work in accordance with the instructions given. This, however, was impossible for them to do, as the archbishops opposed them at every point; and it began to look doubtful whether the Pope would not finally be compelled to yield. Then aid came from various sides. The emperor, on receiving the Punctation, advised the archbishops to try to come to a complete understanding with their suffragan bishops and the secular powers of their dioceses. But this the archbishops neglected to do, and the exclusiveness of their proceedings gave umbrage to the bishops. Many bishops believed, and perhaps not altogether without reason, that the real purpose of the Punctation was to transfer the power which had hitherto been exercised by the Pope to the metropolitans; and they preferred the Pope far away in Rome, to the metropolitans close at their doors. Thus it came to pass that several German bishops, headed by the Bishop of Spires, declared against the Punctation. A still more effective aid the Pope obtained from the Emperor, who appointed his coadjutor. But this could not be done without the consent of the Pope; and he now supported the nuncio with all his might in the contest with the archbishops. The archbishops were defeated. Finally the union between the archbishops became loosened by the ambiguous behavior of the Archbishop of Mayence. He was a member of the Fürstenbund (Union of Princes) which Friedrich II. had formed in 1785 against Austria; and, as he was an old man, Friedrich was very anxious to have Baron von Dahlberg, who was decidedly in favor of the Fürstenbund, appointed his coadjutor. But this could not be done without the consent of the Pope; and it was not probable that the Pope would give his consent without certain stipulations with respect to the Punctation. Secret negotiations were carried on with the papal court through Prussia; and, though no definite results ensued, the union of the archbishops was incipiently for action. When the case was laid before the diet of Ratisbon (1788), the diet advised the archbishops to seek reconciliation with the Pope, each for himself. The brooding thunderstorm in France, whose first low murmur just now became audible, also acted as a persuasion to take the question; and the Pope's answer to the Punctation (November, 1789) was consequently received with a kind of passive and silent acquiescence, though it openly took its stand upon the Isidorean decreals, and flatly denied the justness of any of the remarks of the Punctation. See CHR. F. WEIDENFELD: Geschichte des Nuniaturstreites, 1788; MÜNCH: Geschichte des Emscr Congresses, 1840. H. SCHMID.

ENCRACTITES (abstinentes) is not the name of any distinct sect, but denotes generally the adherents of a certain fast view among the ascetics. Among the adherents of this view, enjoining abstinence from flesh-meat, wine, the marriage-bed, etc., did not originate within the pale of Christianity. It was found a long time before our era, in India, among the Jews (the Essenes), and among the Greeks (the Pythagoreans). When enquiring if valid, it became very popular among the Gnostics; though not all Encratites were Gnostics, or held the Gnostic doctrine of matter as evil and a creation of the evil principle. The most prominent leaders among the Encratites were Tatian, Saturninus, Marcion, Julius Cassianus, and Severus. They used the gospel according to the Egyptians, the Acts of Andrew, John, and Thomas, and other apocryphal writings.

ENCYCCLICAL LETTERS are circular letters, which in the ancient church were generally sent by one church to the churches of a certain circuit, but which in our times are sent exclusively by the Pope to the bishops of the Roman-Catholic Church.

ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF THEOLOGY means, in one sense of the words, simply a dictionary of theological knowledge: in another, it denotes a distinct branch of the theological science itself. In that branch, namely, which represents and explains the inner organization of this science, its divisions, and the relation of these divisions, both to each other reciprocally, and to the system as a whole. In this latter sense the name occurs for the first time in S. MURSINNA'S Prime linea Encyclopaedia theologica (Magdeburg, 1784), adopted from the Greek τάξις παθείας ( orbis doctrine), which meant, among the ancient Greeks, that course of general instruction which every free boy had to go through before he adopted a special trade or profession. The real development, however, of theological encyclopaedia as a science, is much later, and was due to Schleiermacher.

As soon as the church began to develop a theology, there arose, of course, certain ideas about what was necessary for a teacher in the church to know in order to fulfil his duty; and hints were thrown out with respect to the proper way in which to attain this knowledge. Thus CHYRSOSTOM'S De officiis ministrorum, AMBROSIUS' De doctrina Christiana, etc., may be considered encyclopedias of theology; only it must be noticed that these works have a practical rather than a theoretical character. They teach how to study theology, rather than explain what theology is. They correspond to what we now call methodology; and this character all works of the kind retain, more or less, up to the days of Schleiermacher. Noticeable during the middle ages are the Didascalion of ITHO OF ST. VICTOR (d. 1141), in which the differentiation begins (the first three books being of purely propedeutic, the last three of marked methodological character), and the De studio theologici of NICOLAUS OF CLELANGIS (b. 1360). From the Reformation the theological encyclopaedia, like every other branch of theological science, received a new impulse. The Lutheran Church produced, among many other works, the Methodus studii theologici, by JOHANN GERHARD, Jena, 1017, and, more in harmony with the spirit of asceticism of the age, the Apparatus theologici, by GEORO CALIXTUS, Helmsläd, 1628. The Reformed Church produced the Theologus seu de ratione studii theologici, by ANDREAS GERHARD (Hyperi-
no). Marburg, 1572, in which the quadruplicate division of theology into exegetical, dogmatical, historical, and practical theology occurs for the first time; and the Academy of Saumur, corresponding in the Reformed Church to the University of Helmstedt in the Lutheran, the essays of Stephan Gaussen, De studii theologici ratione, De natura theologica, etc. The Roman-Catholic Church also showed signs of life. The Bibliotheca selecta de ratione studiorum (Cologne, 1607) is merely an instance of modern scholasticism; but the Methode pour étudier la theologie, by L. Ellies du Pin (1718), is a meritorious work, and was translated into several foreign languages.

A new epoch in the history of the theological encyclopedia, by which this branch of theological science really became a science itself, was ushered in by Schleiermacher’s Darstellung des theologischen Studiums zum Behufe einleitender Vorlesungen, Berlin, 1811. An exposition of the internal organization of the theological system is here attempted and achieved with skill. A tripartite division into philosophical, historical and practical theology, is employed. But the philosophical theology comprises only apologetics and polemics; while dogmatics and ethics, as well as exegesis, belong to historical theology. That part of the book, however, which most strikingly shows the author’s powerful grasp of his subject, is the section on practical theology, considered under the double view of church-government and church-service. At its first appearance this book seemed not to have attracted any particular attention; but, after the appearance of its second edition in 1830, the strong influence which it had exercised soon became evident. In 1831 appeared the Encyclopädie der theologischen Wissenschaften, by K. Rosenkranz, completed under the influence of the Hegelian philosophy; in 1838, the Encyclopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften, by K. R. Hagenbach (11th ed., edited by Kautzsch, 1884); in 1837, the Encyclopädie und Methodologie, by G. C. A. Harless, etc. The influence of Schleiermacher’s work was felt also in the Reformed Church — J. G. Kienlen: Encyclopédie des sciences de la théologie chrétienne, Strasbourg, 1824; Groot: Encyclopaedia theologii christiani, Groningen, 1851; and even in the Roman-Catholic Church, F. A. Staedenaier: Encyclopaedia der theologischen Wissenschaften, Mayence, 1834; (John McClintock: Theological Encyclopaedia and Methodology, Cincinnati, 1873, Dordes: Encyclopaedia der christeliche theologie, Utrecht, 1878); J. R. Lange: Grundriss d. Theolog. Encyk., Heidelberg, 1877; J. Ch. K. V. Hofmann: Encyk., ed. Bestmann, Nördlingen, 1879; J. F. Rögner: Eng. trans., Edinb., 1894 sq.; R. Rothe, Wittenberg, 1890; Crook and Hurst, N.-Y., 1895; Weidner, Phil., N.-A., 1885; APOST. ENCYCLOPAEDIAS, Theological. See Dictionaries.

ENCYCLOPÄDIANS is the name generally given to the editors and contributors to the Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire raisonné des Sciences, des Arts et des Métiers, published in Paris, 1751–64, in 21 vols. fol. This work, so far as it is based on account of the extraordinary influence which it exercised on its age, was edited by Diderot, and, for its mathematical and physical articles, by D’Alembert. Among its contributors were Rousseau, Voltaire, Euler, Buffon, Haller, Mengs, Mette, Montesquieu, D’Anville, Holbach, Sulzer, Turgot, etc. Its religious, theological, and ecclesiastical articles were mostly written by Abbé Mallet, professor of theology in the University of Paris, and the abbés Yvon, Pastré, and De Prades.

It is generally believed that this book is full of open and bold attacks on Christianity, the Roman-Catholic Church, etc. But this is a mistake. Though the article on the Jesuits is written with great gusto for scandal, and though the article on the Pope vindicates the Gallican views of the episcopacy, the work as a whole is confessedly Roman Catholic, and the Reformation, with all that belongs to it, is treated in a supercilious manner as a vicious innovation; to which must be added that there is hardly any Christian dogma which is not accepted and defended,—such as those of the trinity, of inspiration, of the atonement; etc. But (and this is characteristic of the reasons for the acceptance of the Christian dogmas are generally of such a quality that a flat rejection, for no reason whatever, could not have made the matter worse. Theism is preferred to atheism, because it is better for the development of human happiness to accept than to reject the idea of the existence of God. Christ is the first and foremost of all religious founders, because he revealed the best and highest morality, etc.

By this perfidious acquiescence in something which it felt itself too weak to overpower, the book presented itself to the eyes of a godless and religiously indifferent age as the soundest and wisest compromise with an existing superstition, and obtained freedom to preach its sensualistic philosophy, which sooner or later would surely extinguish said superstition. The philosophical programme of the book — that is, its intellectual and moral stand-point — is set forth in the preface, written by D’Alembert; and there is really no contradiction between the sensualism and eudemonism of the preface, and the choice reasons on which religion, Christianity, and the Roman-Catholic Church are accepted and defended in the book.

ENDERGUMENS. See SAUL.
to forty days' fast, then partook of the sacrament; a particular prayer was made for them by the priest, and their names were entered upon the church-records, with especial mention of their recovery. See the excellent art., Evangelium, in Kraus: Real-Encyklopädie.

ENGEDI (the fountain of the kid), the present Ain Jidy, a small town about one mile from the western shore of the Dead Sea, at the foot of the mountains of Judæa, between three hundred and thirty and five hundred feet above the level of the Dead Sea, and about twelve hundred feet below the summit of the cliffs; received its name from the neighboring thermal springs, and is known to history as David's hiding-place from Saul (1 Sam. xxii. 29, xxiv. 1-4).

ENGELBRECHT, Hans, b. at Brunswick, 1599; d. there 1644; was the son of a tailor, and a weaver by trade, but suffered from infancy so much from bodily illness, that he became very melancholy, and at times was oscillating between suicide and lunacy. In his twenty-second year he began to be haunted by religious visions, in which he was called to the ministry; he resigned himself before admiring crowds, generally to the great disgust of the clergy. Expelled from Brunswick, he roved about in Northern Germany, and was at some time imprisoned in Hamburg; but he finally returned to his native city, and died there in loneliness and seclusion. He wrote several pamphlets about his revelations; collected edition in a Dutch translation in 1697 [Eng. trans., Northampton, 1780]. See Rehmeyer: Braunsch. Kirchengesch., IV. p. 417.

ENGELHARDT, Johann Georg Veit, b. at Neustadt-on-the-Aich, Nov. 12, 1791; d. at Erlangen, Sept. 13, 1855; studied at Erlangen, and was appointed professor at the gymnasiurn there (1817), and professor of theology in the university (1821). Besides a number of dissertations on the church fathers and the mystics, he wrote a Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte in 4 vols., Erlangen, 1833-34, and a Dogmengeschichte in 2 vols., Neustadt-on-the-Aich, 1839.

ENGLAND, Church of, is the established National Church of England, and adopts as its creed the Thirty-nine Articles, together with the Book of Common Prayer. In its autonomous organization it is, like the other churches of the Protestant Reformation, the product of emancipation from the Church of Rome; and its history begins with the reign of Henry VIII., when, breaking with the Pope, he was declared head of the Church in his dominions. In theology it has preserved the general features of the Protestant churches of the Continent; but, in the department of ecclesiastical government, it has retained in unbroken succession the three orders of the larger pale from which it came. It is proper here to state that many Anglo-Catholic writers regard the Reformation merely as an incident in the history of the Church of England, which did not interrupt its historic continuity, dating from Augustine, or even from the old Celtic Church.

1. Introductory.—The history of Christianity in England before the Reformation has given three well-defined periods, — the British, Saxon, and Norman.

The annals of the British period are sparse and unsatisfactory. The traditional accounts of the founding of the Christian Church among the Britons by Joseph of Arimathea, St. Paul, or other of the apostles, as well as the history of the conversion of King Lucius, adopted by Ussher, must be given up as untrustworthy. Of first reliable information comes from Tertullian, who writes early in the third century that Christianity had penetrated into regions of Britain inaccessible to the Romans. The history of the British Church was thenceforth that of early Christianity everywhere. It furnished victims to persecution, one of whom, Alban (303), was early canonized. It sent its representatives to councils, as, for example, that of Arles (314), which three of its bishops attended,—Eborus, Restitutus, and Adeilus. And it had its heresies. Pelagius was a Briton; and, although he went to the East with Celestius of Ireland, he left the seed of his errors behind him.

The Anglo-Saxon period dates from the arrival, in 597, of the monk Augustine, who had been despatched by Gregory I. The Anglo-Saxons were still heathen when he landed on the Isle of Thanet. Augustine expounded the gospel, and introduced the Church to the court of Æthelberht of Kent, whose queen, Bertha, was the Christian daughter of the Frankish King Charibert. He was made bishop of the English, and afterwards metropolitan. Augustine came in conflict with the bishops of the old British Church; but the Roman type of Christianity prevailed over the Keltic (see Keltic Church), and crowded it out. Christianity spread rapidly in Southern England, and was introduced into Northumbria by Paulinus, and made the permanent religion by the labors of St. Aidan of Ireland. Under Theodore of Tarsus (consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury 668) the English episcopate was fully organized, and the dioceses grouped around Canterbury as the central and superior see. During this period monasteries were founded; and here and there a solitary form,—like Ceddmon, the Monk of Whitby; or Bede, “the father of English learning;” or Alcuin the scholar, called to the court of Charlemagne,—stands out prominently on the dark background. The Danish invaders of the eighth and ninth centuries interrupted the services, and devastated the property of churches and monastic orders. Nevertheless, the judicious wisdom and enlightened zeal of Dunstan (959-988), the first of many English ecclesiastical statesmen, repaired their ravages, and effected a severer discipline and a more compact organization of the clergy.

The Norman period dates from the battle of Hastings in 1066. It is distinguished by the complete vassalage into which the Church went to the papal see, the humiliating subjection of the State to ecclesiastical domination, and the growing corruption of the clergy. But the State, in turn, struggled to emancipate itself from ecclesiastical fetters by legislation, and the people to rid themselves of clerical incompetency and scandal by a reform in the life and doctrines of the Church. — William the Conqueror dealt harshly with the Saxon bishops and abbots, many of whom were obliged to give up their privileges, and he practically chose all ecclesiastical dignitaries himself. But under his successors, able ecclesiastics asserted and won the independence of the Church. Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canter-
bury (1070–89), secured the institution of special ecclesiastical courts, in which all ecclesiastical cases were tried. His successor, the learned Anselm (1093–1109), obliged the crown to relinquish its ancient custom of investing the new bishops with ring and crozier, and vindicated the dangerous precedent, that appeals should be made to Rome. Another great archbishop, Thomas a Becket (1162–70), contended with Henry II., who sought to reform the abuses growing out of clerical exemption from civil jurisdiction. The churchman was murdered, but victory did not rest with the king. It still remained for the State as a national body to come into subjection to the ecclesiastical power of Rome. This was accomplished under the most depraved, but, according to Green, the ablest, of the Angevin kings, John. For daring to resist the wishes of the papal see, his realm was placed under interdict by Innocent III. (1208). John finally submitted (a submission which was no more ignominious than it was politic), and accepted Stephen Langton (1207–29), the papal appointee, as primate.

The Church passed into a state of lethargy, and the clergy into official carelessness and personal corruption. The earnest and plain preaching of the Dominican (1221) and Franciscan (1224) friars aroused the laity for a time; but, becoming fat with lands, they lost their hold on the popular mind. Here and there a great bishop, like Grosseteste of Lincoln, 1235–53 (see GROSSETESTE), lifts up his voice boldly against the corruption of the clergy, dares to resist the Pope's assumption to force appointments within his diocese, and insists upon the authority and preaching of the Scriptures. The State is not completely paralyzed, and seeks to meet the ecclesiastical abuses with remedial legislation. Two great acts stand out as protests against them. The statute of mortmain (1279) forbade the alienation of lands to religious corporations in such wise as to be exempt from taxation. The statute of praemunire (Richard II.) made a royal race necessary to the validity within the realm of papal appointments and bulls. Neither of these acts accomplished much at the time, but the latter was used effectively by Henry VIII. Finally protests from the people and clergy themselves were beginning to be spoken. John Wycliff (1328–84), the "morning star of the Reformation," translated the Scriptures, and asserted the rights of conscience. William Longland, without Wycliff's scholarship, but in a more popular and earnest vein than he, sang rhymes ridiculing the friars. The Lollards were so numerous, that, according to the chronicler Knighton, every other person on the road was one. The indistinct mutterings of the Reformation were heard; and although Wycliff's ashes were disinterred, and scattered in the Swift, and the Church slumbered on for more than a century longer, the great movement finally came, out of which Christianity in England, crystallized in the Church of England, started forward on a new career of life and achievement.

II. History since the Reformation.—The Church of England dates its existence as a national body, independent of the papal see, from the passage of the Act of Supremacy (1534), and received its distinctive doctrinal characteristic from the Forty-two Articles in the reign of Edward VI. (subsequently reduced to thirty-nine under Elizabeth), and the approval of the Book of Common Prayer. The same general principle of revolt against the Pope again emerged in England, and was involved in the Reformation movement in England that inspired the Reformation on the Continent. However, the movement in England had its own salient and distinguishing features. It preserved in unbroken continuity the ecclesiastical orders and succession of the Catholic Church, many of the bishops identifying themselves with it. But it did not in the first instance owe its origin to a pure motive to remedy ecclesiastical abuses, and correct doctrinal errors. The inglorious character of some of its early history, as Canon Perry says, cannot be denied. Yet some of the reformers of England, like Ridley and Latimer, were men of most fervent piety and lofty devotion; and its first annals describe the heroic constancy of a noble galaxy of martyrs who sacrificed their lives for their faith.

Circumstances had been preparing the way for the Reformation in England. The signs of the times in this part of the world indicated a mighty movement of men's minds in England as well as on the Continent. The revival of classical learning with such names as Erasmus, Colet, and Thomas More, the bold satire upon clerical abuses, the independence of thought (e.g., Erasmus' appeal to the Greek New Testament in the preface of his edition, Basel, 1516, and More's dreams of improvements in Church and State in his Utopia), the translation of the New Testament by Tyndale (1526), and its circulation in spite of public burnings and private espionage, were amongst the signs. Luther's mighty words from across the sea, airing the papal dominion as the Babylonish captivity of the Church (1520), found an eager audience in England, which the public conflagration of his tracts by Wolsey (1521) could not quiet. But these were only the signs and forerunners of the Reformation: they did not accomplish it. The rupture from Rome in England was not, in the first instance, the product of the protest of religious principle against ecclesiastical abuse, however widely prevalent Reformation sentiments were among all classes: it was a political necessity to which Henry VIII. resorted in order to accomplish and to justify his divorce from Catherine, and marriage with Anne Boleyn. In 1531 Henry arraigned the clergy of a violation of praemunire for being accomplices with Cardinal Wolsey, who had exercised legatine functions without the royal consent. The two convocations compounded by the payment of a hundred and eighteen thousand pounds. But the king, not satisfied with this evidence of a submissive temper, demanded that he should be recognized as "chief protector, the only supreme lord and head of the Church and clergy in England." The Convocation of Canterbury accepted the title, only adding the limitation that as far as the law of Christ will allow." In 1533 a parliamentary statute forbade all ecclesiastical appeals beyond the kingdom. The year following, actuated thereto by the Pope's command to take back Catherine, Henry secured the passage of the Act of Supremacy, by which the English sovereign was declared as "the supreme head in earth of the Church of England,"
called the "Anglicana Ecclesia." This statute made all papal appointments within the realm illegal, and vested in the crown unlimited authority to reform and redress ecclesiastical abuses. The Church in England was thus severed from the papal communion, and constituted an independent body. It was not long, however, before a bold use of his new authority by abolishing the monastic establishments, and confiscating their wealth, amounting to thirty-eight million pounds (1536—39).

But a thorough doctrinal reformation was not among the purposes of Henry. With the Continental Reformation he had little or no sympathy. The ten articles adopted by convocation in 1536 retained the doctrine of the real presence, the use of images, prayer to saints, purgatory, and auricular confession, and only divested these practices of some of the grosser superstitions. The king seemed to take higher ground when he gave his sanction to the translation of the Scriptures known as the Great Bible (1539). But all hopes of a thorough doctrinal reformation were doomed to disappointment. The six so-called "Bloody Articles" of 1539 denounced all denial of transubstantiation as heresy, and declared strongly in favor of auricular confession, the celibacy of the clergy, and the sacrifice of private masses. Henry had done his work. He was no reformer from principle; but Providence had used him to assert the independence of the Church of England, and to break the spell of tradition.

Under Edward VI. the doctrinal reformation was accomplished. The six articles were repealed, and the sympathy with the Continental reformers shown in the call of Bucer and Fagius to Cambridge, and Peter Martyr and Ochino to Oxford. A Prayer-Book was issued in 1549, and a Second Prayer-Book—entirely free from ecclesiastical vestments, and in favor of the Genevan form of government. Cartwright, Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, was the ablest exponent of these views (1570). There was no uniformity practised in the conduct of public services and the dress of the clergy. Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester, who died at the stake (1555), for a long time refused to be consecrated; from conscientious scruples against the usual episcopal habits; and Bishop Jewel pronounced the clerical garb a stage dress, and a relic of the Amorites. It is noticeable that two of Elizabeth's archbishops — Parker (1559—75) and Grindal (1575—83) — were averse to enforcing uniformity in these matters. The latter, with Bishops Parkhurst and Ponet, not only would not have allowed a co-ordinate authority to the presbyterian system of Geneva, but would have gone even farther (Macaulay, Hist. Eng., vol. I. p. 39, Boston ed.). Grindal was so lukewarm in obeying the will of the queen for the suppression of the Puritan "Prophecyings," as to incur suspension from his office. By a royal proclamation these were suppressed, as before a royal proclamation had required the use of clerical vestments. It thus was decided that no liberty in matters of ritual and the conduct of public worship was to be tolerated. These acts were aversive to enforcing uniformity in these matters. The latter, with Bishops Parkhurst and Ponet, not only would not have allowed a co-ordinate authority to the presbyterian system of Geneva, but would have gone even farther (Macaulay, Hist. Eng., vol. I. p. 39, Boston ed.). Grindal was so lukewarm in obeying the will of the queen for the suppression of the Puritan "Prophecyings," as to incur suspension from his office. By a royal proclamation these were suppressed, as before a royal proclamation had required the use of clerical vestments. It thus was decided that no liberty in matters of ritual and the conduct of public worship was to be tolerated. These acts were aversive to enforcing uniformity in these matters.
The controversy was closed in 1593 by an act of Parliament making Puritanism an offence against the statute law.

The history of the seventeenth century is marked by the consolidation of the Church in spite of a temporary triumph of Puritanism, the growth of the doctrine of the essential necessity of episcopacy, the first indications of which show themselves in the Puritan controversy of the Elizabethan period, and a consequent intolerance towards all dissent from its forms and doctrines, culminating in the harsh legislation of Charles II. Under James I. (1603–25), who came to England with a cordial hatred of Presbyterianism, the Puritan party was completely humiliated. All their hopes, expressed in the famous Mildmay Petition, signed by eight hundred clergymen, and asking for the removal of superstitious usages from the Prayer-Book, etc., were doomed to disappointment. James maintained relations with the churches of the Continent, and sent five commissioners to represent the Church of England at the synod of Dort with instructions to “favour no innovations in doctrine, and to conform to the confessions of the neighboring Reformed churches.” But full sympathy with the Continental churches was hereafter rendered impracticable, and recognition of their orders (as was the case under Elizabeth, see Professor Fisher, in the New-Englander, January, 1874, pp. 121–172) impossible by the high views of episcopacy which were spreading, and which, under Archbishop Laud (1633–45), assumed an extreme form. This prelate taught that episcopacy was not necessary to the well-being, but essential to the very being, of the Church. His administration revived the ritual of Rome, and displayed, or seemed to display, so much sympathy with it, that he was offered a cardinal’s hat. Since his day a large liberty of opinion has been allowed and practised by the evangelical spirit and earnest preaching of the Methodists. The intellectual classes were affected by the deistic controversy, which, beginning with Lord Herbert of Cherbury (1581–1648), identified the Christian revelation with natural religion, and excluded from Christianity, as genuine and false, all that was not contained in the writings as it was common for them in their practice to treat its precepts with contempt. But while deism was being resolved into scepticism by Hume, its influence was more than counteracted by the evangelical spirit and earnest preaching of Whitefield and the Wesleys (graduates of Oxford), which worked with irresistible power upon the masses, and aroused the clergy of the realm out of their indifference to a new sense of their spiritual obligations. Fresh life sprang up in the Church of England as a result of this impulse. The so-called Evangelicals, including some of the most faithful pastors, fervent preachers, devout poets, and genial philanthropists,—men like Venn and Newton and Cowper and Wilberforce,—brought a warm consecration to their work, and vied with the more eloquent but no more devoted leaders of the Methodist movement to spread the truths and blessings of the gospel. And so the century went out with an intense sympathy for the heathen abroad and the depraved classes at home, in practical efforts to plant missions, and found charitable institutions.

The present century has witnessed the realization of these plans in part or in whole. No preceding period has been distinguished for piety at home or abroad more than the nineteenth century. This is eminently true of the Church of England. It has also given evidence of vigor, as well as been distracted, by discussions of ecclesiastical order and discipline. The so-called Tractarian movement has agitated the Church to its depths. While Parliament was legislating in the interest of equal political
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hold that nothing is taught in the Thirty-nine Articles which cannot be harmonized with the Tridentine decrees. An unprejudiced study of the plain and natural meaning of the language, without any inferences from what is left unsaid, will force upon us the conclusion that the Anglican standards teach a moderate Calvinism, and are, in the main, in sympathy with the Protestant Reformation of the Continent. The sole and supreme authority of the Scriptures is emphasized, as also justification by faith; Art. xi. reading, “Wherefore that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine,” etc. Original or birth sin is the corruption of nature of every descendent of Adam; and predestination is God’s everlasting purpose to redeem “those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind” (Art. xvi). The erroneous doctrines of purgatory, the mass, celibacy, etc., are specifically denounced. The teaching concerning the Lord’s Supper is plainly against transubstantiation, which in Art. xxviii. is declared to be “repugnant to the plain words of Scripture,” the “body of Christ being given, taken, and eaten only after a heavenly and spiritual manner.” Art. xxvii. can hardly be pressed to favor the theory of baptismal regeneration. But the case is different in the service of baptism in the Prayer-Book. After the child has been baptized, the minister says, “Seeing now that this child is regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ,” etc. And again, after repeating the Lord’s Prayer, he gives thanks to the heavenly Father for regenerating the infant, etc. These words interpreted naturally teach baptismal regeneration; but they are frequently explained as being used only in a hypothetical sense. For a fuller statement under this head, see ARTICLES THIRTY-NINE.

The worship of the Church of England is liturgical, and regulated by the Book of Common Prayer, one of the most precious legacies of the Protestant Reformation. Its beautiful forms of service, and its solemn and venerable prayers, are not only among the choicest specimens of English, but exert an influence on the ear and heart of those who use them which nothing else can replace. The rubrics (so called from having been printed in red ink) give directions for the exact details of the service. The sabbath services consist of prayers, lessons from the Scriptures, responsive reading of the Psalms, chants, hymns, the offertory, and the sermon. The form and matter of the service of baptism, communion, marriage, and other services, are all prescribed. The inconveniences of this method are not to be overlooked, by which all departure from the fixed form is forbidden. An illustration is found in the service of burial. In all cases, over the most notorious sinner, as well as the pious churchman, the same consolatory passages (1 Cor. xv., etc.) are read, and the same prayers offered. But, on the other hand, there are manifest advantages which it would be hard to deny. See, on this subject, art. LITURGY.

IV. The Clergy and Clerical Patronage. — The clergy consists of three orders,—deacons, priests (presbyters), and bishops. The usual age is respectively twenty-three, twenty-four, and thirty. The duties of the deacons are to render assistance to the priest in the services of the sanctuary and

rights, a movement in the interest of deeper piety, more aggressive effort, churchly zeal, and church authority, was spreading at Oxford (1839). Dr. Pusey was the intellectual leader, and the saintly Keble the poet, of this movement. It led to a new investigation of the claims of the Catholic Church; and, before a decade had passed, the Church received a blow, from which, Lord Beaconsfield said a few years ago, it “still continues to reel.” John Henry Newman, Edward Manning, Frederick W. Faber, and others of her ablest men of the clergy and nobility, went over to the Roman-Catholic communion.

The present state of opinion in the Church is classified under three heads. The High-Church party lays emphasis upon the exclusive right of episcopacy and apostolical succession, and practises an advanced ritual. The extreme wing, known as the Ritualists, has introduced practices which the Reformers regarded as papistical,—such as the elevation of the host, auricular confession, the burning of candles, etc. Some of their number go even so far as to declare the Reformation to have been a mistake and a misfortune. They display great zeal and devotion in benevolent church-work. Occupying opposite ground is the Low-Church party, which holds strictly to the natural interpretation of the Thirty-nine Articles, denies episcopacy to be of the essence of the Church, and renounces so-called ritualistic practices. Between these two schools a third has grown up within the last fifty years. Its combination of tolerant sympathies with loyalty to the Church has secured for it the name of the Broad-Church party. Among its more prominent representatives have been Arnold, Julius Hare, Maurice, Kingsley, and Stanley. During the century the vigorous life of the Church has been further shown by the restoration of cathedrals, and construction of churches, in the creation of new episcopal sees at home,—Truro, St. Albans (1877), and Liverpool (1880),—and the rapid extension of the Church and Episcopate in the Colonies. At no time in its history has it been stronger and more vigorous than now, more alive with theological discussion and achievement, more hospitable to open with integrity, more solicitous to relieve the poor and fallen, more munificent in its gifts for the conversion of the heathen, or more adapted to secure the esteem, and win the respect, of the Anglo-Saxon people on the island of Latimer and Ridley, as well as far beyond the seas, in the United States and Australia and India.

III. Theology and Worship. — The doctrinal standards of the Anglican Church are the Thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer. To these may be added the Catechism and the two Books of Homilies issued in the reign of Edward VI., and sanctioned by the Thirty-nine Articles. Within the pale of the Church the most divergent views have prevailed concerning its doctrinal status. On the one hand it has been represented as strongly Calvinistic, both in respect to the sacraments and to the decrees; on the other, theologians,—such as Dr. Newman (before his transition to Rome), the late Dr. Forbes, Bishop of Brechin, Dr. Pusey (Eirenicon), and others,—minimizing the Protestantism of its standards,
in pastoral work. He may preach, read the prayers and Scripture-lessons, assist in the distribution of the elements at communion, and administer baptism. In his ordination he assents to the Thirty-nine Articles and the constitution of the Episcopal Church as agreeable with the word of God. The priest serves at the altar, and consecrates the elements in the Lord's Supper. At his ordination the bishop pronounces upon him the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God," etc. This is interpreted to be a petition for the anointing of the Holy Spirit, or to mark the transmission of a heavenly grace through the bishop, according to the different standpoint of the interpreter. The bishop has the exclusive right of ordination, confirmation, or admitting members to the Lord's table, and the consecration of churches. Bishops are appointed by the crown. A congé d'élire is sent to the chapter when a bishopric is vacant; but it is only a formality, as the name of the new incumbent is sent with it. A class of the priesthood known as the dignified clergy are the deans and archdeacons. Deans have charge of cathedral churches, and are assisted by canons, the number of which may not exceed six for any cathedral. The archdeacon assists the bishop in his official duties as superintendent of the diocese. He holds synods, delivers charges, and visits parishes. He is himself sometimes aided by rural deans. Both these classes are members of convocation by virtue of their office. No bishop is allowed to transgress the limits of his diocese in the performance of episcopal functions, unless requested so to do. The bishops frequently associate with themselves suffragan bishops.

England is divided into the two archbishoprics of Canterbury and York. Within the limits of the former there are twenty-three sees, including the two new ones (Truro and St. Albans) created 1877, within the latter, seven.—Durham, Ripon, Chester, Carlisle, Manchester, Liverpool (organized 1880), and Sodor and Man. In the order of dignity they rank, Canterbury, York, London, Durham, Winchester, etc. In addition to the Irish (twelve) and Scotch (seven) bishops, there are at present, in connection with the Church of England, sixty-six bishops, deans, and archdeacons. The first colonial see was Nova Scotia (1757). The see of Calcutta was organized 1813. Nineteen colonial or missionary bishops have resigned their sees, and are now living in England. There are thirty deans presiding over as many cathedrals. The Deans of Westminster and Windsor are independent of episcopal control, and directly subject to the crown. All the sees have deans, except Liverpool, St. Albans, Truro, and Sodor and Man. There are eighty-two archdeacons, and six hundred and thirteen rural deans. The lower clergy of the Church in England and Wales (who number about 23,000) are called "rector," "vicar," "curate," etc. The benefices, or livings, number nearly 13,500. Their patron is divided between the crown (1,350 livings), the bishops (1,350), universities (750), private patrons (2,500), etc. The consent of the bishop at the deanery is necessary to the induction of an archdeacon. The consent of a dean is necessary to the appointment of a curate. In case of a disagreement between parson and curate, the case is decided by the Court of Arches. The people have no voice in the choice of their rector; but the rector, once inducted, has absolute control of his church, so that not even the bishop may enter it without his consent. Many of the parishes have endowments in lands: others are supported, in whole or in part, from public funds, such as Queen Anne's Bounty. The system of patronage has led to very great abuses, some of which still remain. Benefices are sometimes held up for public sale, and, being subject to the choice of private patrons, may be filled with men of little ability or small interest in the spiritual welfare of the people. The Plurality system, by which a clergyman might hold any number of livings at the same time, and which was so much abused in the latter part of the last century, has been modified by parliamentary legislation. Under the present law no one can hold two cathedral positions at the same time. The holder of a cathedral position may hold besides only one parish. A deanery may have two parishes; but, if the one numbers three thousand souls, the other may not include more than five hundred. The evils of non-residence have likewise been restrained by law. The yearly income of the Church of England amounts to at least eight million pounds. The income of the Archbishop of Canterbury is fifteen thousand pounds; of York, ten thousand pounds; of London, ten thousand pounds; of Durham, eight thousand pounds. The lowest income is that of the Bishop of Sodor and Man, which amounts to two thousand pounds. The average income of a dean is one thousand pounds. The incomes of the clergy are from one hundred and fifty pounds upward. A fund managed by the so-called "Ecclesiastical Commission," and supplied by the revenues of suppressed canony, sines, and the surplus revenues of bishopric over and above the episcopal salary, is used for the augmentation of bishoprics, the maintenance of smaller salaries, the endowment of new ministers, etc. This commission was constituted in 1835.

V. Church Polity.—The Church or spirituality of England is one of the estates of the realm. Its relation to the State is one of dependence, the Sovereign being its supreme governor, and the Church following his legislative and judicial enactments. The Archbishop of Canterbury is the first peer in the realm, and crowns the king. The bishops have their "palaces," and seats in the House of Lords, except the Bishops of Sodor and Man, Liverpool, Truro, and St. Albans. The Church does not legislate for itself independently or directly: it is subject to Parliament. The Convocations of Canterbury and York are the two highest official church bodies. Constituted by Edward I., they enjoyed independent rights of ecclesiastical legislation until 1532, when, by the Submission of the Clergy, they became subject to the king. In 1717 the Convocation of Canterbury was dissolved by George I., for the supposed hostility of the lower house to the House of Hanover, was not revived till 1852, and did not receive the royal license to proceed to business till 1861. These convocations consist of two houses. Over the upper house, the bishops, the archbishop presides. The lower house, whose presiding officer is called prolocutor, is made up of the archdeacons, deans, and repre-
sentatives of the lower clergy. The laity have no representation. In the Convocation of York there are only two houses, but in the two houses is only made on occasions of actual transaction of business. The archbishops have the right of veto upon all measures. Convocation is assembled by the king's writ, and cannot proceed to make new canons without his license, nor have its decisions validity till confirmed by his sanction.

The judicial business is transacted in three courts. The lowest is the Diocesan Consistory Court, presided over by the bishop's chancellor. Appealed cases go up to the Court of Arches, the official head of which is styled Dean of the Arches. The last tribunal of appeal is the king in council. There are three church censures,—suspension (for the neglect of parish duties), deprivation, and degradation. The two latter follow upon the disuse of the Prayer-Book, teachings subversive of the Thirty-nine Articles, simony, or conviction in a civil court. The Court of Arches alone exercises the right of deprivation.


ENGLISH BIBLE VERSIONS. 1. Anglo-Saxon.

The earliest monument is that of Cædmon, a monk of Whitby (d. 680), On the Origin of Things, consisting of poetical paraphrases of parts of the Bible, some of which were published by Junius at Amsterdam, 1655, and most of them by Thorpe (Cædmon's Metrical Paraphrase of Parts of the Holy Scripture, with an English translation, notes, etc.), London, 1832. In the beginning of the eighth century Aldhelm and Guthlac produced an interlinear Anglo-Saxon version of the Psalter on the basis of the Roman text. The manuscript is among the Cotton Manuscripts marked Vespasian A., 1. In 790 (circa) Eadfrith, Bishop of Lindisfarne, translated parts of the Gospels (Durham Book, Cotton Manuscripts, Nero D., IV.); and the Venerable Bede died (735) while engaged on the translation of John, in which he only proceeded to the beginning of chapter six. Parts of the Book of Exodus and the Psalter were translated by King Alfred (d. 901). The Rushworth Gloss (in the Bodleian Library), an interlinear evangelistical, made by Farmer and Owen about the same time, is peculiarly interesting from the agreement of its Latin text with the Codex Bezae where it differs from the Textus Receptus. Proverbs, in part, in an interlinear version, belongs to the tenth century (Cotton Manuscripts, Vespasian D., VI.). Towards the close of that century Aelfric, peculiarly odious to the monks of the period, produced in popular form paraphrases of the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges, parts of the historical books (Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles), Esther, Job (perhaps), Judith, and the Maccabees. Of these, the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Job, and part of Judith, were printed in the Heptateuchus, edited by Thwaites, Oxonia, 1699, 8vo. An Anglo-Saxon version of the Gospels, of somewhat later date, by an unknown translator, based on an antecedent Byzantine Latin text, with a preface by John Foxe the martyrologist, was printed in London by John Daye, 1571, 4to. There exist, likewise, in manuscript, several copies of the Psalter, written shortly before the Conquest, and three Anglo-Norman manuscripts of the Gospels, of which the first is assigned to the time of William III., and the two others to
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2. Wiclifite.— Prior to Wiclif we have the Ormulum, so called from its author, Orm or Ormin, an English monk who lived in or about the twelfth century, and says in the preface, Thias boc is nemmedd Ormulum, Forthi that Orm it werhite. It is a metrical paraphrase on the Gospels and Acts, neither alliterative nor in rhyme, but in imitation of a certain species of Latin medieval poems, and is remarkable for its smooth, fluent, and regular versification. It was published by W. White, Oxford, 1832.—The Socitelehe, a very large volume (Bodleian Manuscripts, 779), assigned to the thirteenth century, author unknown, contains, among other writings, a metrical paraphrase of the Old and New Testaments. — A paraphrase, in the Northern dialect, of Genesis and Exodus, author and date unknown (? before 1300), and a metrical version of the Psalms, the first known translation into English, from the text of the Gallican (Jerome's) Latin Psalter, are among the manuscripts of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. — The first prose translation of the Psalter into English is that of Richard Rolle, hermit of the same; stie, ascend; senuey, mustard; culueris, though quaint. The peculiar strength of the Authorized Version is of Wiclifite origin. In the absence of illustrations, for which no space can be found, a few examples of curious renderings may be given (Matt. v. 22, "fy" or "foth" for "raca;" Luke xvi. 13, "bishop" for "high priest"), as well as of explanatory glosses, now more obscure than the word to be explained; e.g., vvel fame, schenedesche; incorrupti le, that may not dye ne ben pcyretl; iustified, founten trew; accception of persons, that is put onn biore to other that is withouten desert. Of obsolete words, the following are samples: tendith, kindleh; anentis, with; unbileful, unbelieving; leende, loins; herbore, lodging; maunetis, idols; haburion, breastplate; areltid, imputed; that great work a much longer period. His translation, which imprints that he must have been obnoxious to the clergy, that he left for the Continent, where he translated the New Testament from the Greek as early as 1502; but upon his removal to London in 1522 met with so little encouragement there for the accomplishment of his purpose, and on account of his evangelical sentiments became so obnoxious to the clergy, that he left for the Continent, where he translated the New Testament (1524-25) from the Greek, strongly but legitimately influenced by Luther's Version. He proceeded to Cologne, and was carrying his quartio edition through the press, when, in consequence of the opposition of the local authorities, instigated by Cochesius, he had to leave the city with the unfinished sheets, and completed the printing of the first edition (4to) and the second edition (8vo), a work, which he had undertaken in hiding under an assumed name, and where he translated the Pentateuch, and had it as well as other works printed, are not yet
fixed: the strongest probability points to Wittenberg. But the writer of this article feels war
tanted to announce the established facts, that the Philosopher, his professor, in Marburg, the
Hans Luft never had a printing-press in that
place, and that neither Tyndale nor Fryth ever
were at Marburg. These conclusions, published
by the author Dec. 10, 1881, have since been
fully confirmed by Professor Dr. Julius Caesar,
the librarian of the University of Marburg, and
are stated at length in his forthcoming
volume on the English versions. — The numerous
suprettitious editions of Tyndale's New Testament
cannot be noticed here. The Pentateuch was
published in 1530, the Book of Jonah in 1531.
There is evidence that Tyndale translated, though
he did not live to publish, other portions of the
Old Testament from the Hebrew, most probably
to the end of Second Chronicles, and several of
the prophetic books. The translation of the
Old Testament was his occupation in the gloomy
prison of Vilvorde, where he was confined from
May, 1535, till Oct. 6, 1536, which day he suf-
fred martyrdom, having been first strangled, and
then burned. — Tyndale's translation is the first
English version made from the original tongues.
His helps were very meagre; and although he used
the Vulgate, Wiclif, and Luther, he is thoroughly
independent. His English is noble, and his phrase-
cy Saxon, his idiom singularly pure; and much
of his version remains unchanged in the Author-
ized Version, of which it is really the original
basis. Samples of his felicitous renderings are:
(Matt. xiv. 14) "his heart did melt upon them;"
(xv. 27) "the whelps eat of the crumbs;" (xxiv.
11) "iniquity shall have the upper hand;" (Mark
viii. 29) "thou art very Christ;" (Luke xxi. 1)
"the feast of sweet bread drew nigh, which is
called Easter;" (John ii. 7) "filled them up to
the hard brim;" (Acts xii. 18) "there was not a
little ado among the soldiers;" (1 Cor. ii. 10)
"searcheth the bottom of God's secrets;" (Phil. 
iii. 8) "I have confided in thee from the very heart
root in Jesus Christ;" (1 Tim. vi. 4) "but wasteth his brains about questions;" (Heb. vii.
1) "this is the pith;" (Jas. i. 1) "which are
scattered here and there." Samples of homely
phrases: (Matt. xxvi. 80) "and when they had
said grace;" (Bev. i. 10) "I was in the Spirit on
a Sunday;" (Acts xiv. 13) "brought oxen and
garlands unto the church porch." — The numer-
ous editions of Tyndale's New Testament cannot
be noticed here beyond saying that that of 1525
(1526) is the first; and that of 1534—35, with the
monogram G. H. on the second title, the last.
(See Fry's Collation of Three New Testaments of
William Tyndale, etc., and Biographical
Description of Tyndale's New Testaments, and of two
editions of the Bishops' Version, London, 1879.)

4. Coverdale's. — Miles Coverdale, b. about 1498 at Coverdale, in the North Riding of York-
shire, was educated at Cardinal College, Oxford, by John, Bishop of Chalcedon, at Norwich, in
1514. He fled to the Continent; but his meeting
with Tyndale is purely conjectural, and his hav-
ing assisted him in the translation of the Scrip-
tures not only improbable, but absurd; for he
was not an independent scholar, and his moder-
ate proficiency in the tongues the accretion of a later
period. Where he was from 1528 to 1535 is not
positively known. At the instance of Cranmer
he took in hand the translation of the Bible; and,
as he was unquestionably an excellent German
scholar, his proficiency in German explains, as
the nature of its execution sustains, the honest
titlepage of his first edition of the Bible (printed
most probably by Froshoever at Zurich, 1535);
viz., Biblia — the Bible: that is, the Holy Scrip-
ture of the Olde and Newe Testament, Faithful-
ly and truly translated out of Douche and Latyn in to
Englishe, MDXXXV. The "Douche" undoubt-
elly signifies "German," and the German versions
he used were Luther's and the Zurich, perhaps
also the Worms editions. The Latin versions he
used were the Vulgate and that of Pagninus; and
the published portions of Tyndale were the basis
of his English. The Old Testament from Second
Chronicles onward is Coverdale's own work: that
is, it is a translation of Luther's and the Zürich
versions, and a very servile one. His Duglott New
Testament (exhibiting the English and the Vul-
gate in parallel columns) appeared in three edi-
tions (1538); his Bible was published in London
by Andrewes Hester in 1550, and by R. Jounges
in 1553. The part Coverdale had in the produc-
tion of the Great Bible is noticed below. Coverdale's
Version, though a second-hand production, has
the merit of a pure and strong idiom: it is the
basis of the version of the Psalter in the Book
of Common Prayer. His language and his render-
ings are very musical; e.g., (Ps. xc. 10) "The
days of our age are threescore years and ten;" 
(Isa. xlvi. 19) "Thy seed shall be like as the
sand in the sea, and the fruit of thy body like the
gavel-stones thereof; thy name shall not be
rooted out, nor destroyed before me." He is also
very quaint; e.g., (Job xix. 18) "Yea, the very
desert fools despise me;" (Prov. xvi. 28) "he
that is a blabbe of his tongue maketh division;" 
(Jer. vii. 1) "graven upon the edge of your
altars with a pen of iron and with an adamant
claw;" (Col. ii. 10) "Let no man make you
shoot at a wrong mark which after the own
choosing walketh in humbleness and spirituality
of angels, things which he never saw."

5. Matthew's. — The name of Thomas Matthew
is an alias of John Rogers, b. about 1500, at
Deritend (in Birmingham); educated at Pem-
broke Hall, Cambridge (B.A., 1528); transferred
to Cardinal College, Oxford, where he took orders
the same year. He was next rector of Holy
Trinity, London (1532), and accepted the chap-
llacy at Antwerp, probably in 1534; there he
became acquainted with Tyndale, and subse-
quently his literary executor. He published
(where is not known, but most probably at Wit-
tenberg) a folio edition of the Bible, entitled
The Bible, which is all the Holy Scriptures, in which
are contained the Olde and Newe Testaments, truly
and purely translated into English, by Thomas
Matthew. Enops I, Hearcken to, ye heavens, and
thou earth, grace and priynted at London by John
Hester, MDXXXVII. This folio is a composite
volume, and its critical analysis shows that the Penta-
teach, and the portion from Joshua to Second
Chronicles, as well as the whole of the New Test-
ament, are Tyndale's translation: the remainder
is Coverdale's. He mustered together these materials, but very skilfully
edited and revised them. He added very valu-
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ble preface.

ble preface matter, especially the "Summe and content of all the Holy Scripture, both of the Olde and the Newe Testament," and "A Table of the pryncipal matters conteyned in the Byble, in which the readers may fynde and practyse many common places," filling twenty-six folio pages, and constituting a sort of concordance and dictionary. It is chiefly taken from the French Bible of Olivetan. He likewise added several alternate renderings in his notes, introduced by the formula, "Some reade." He placed the contents or summaries before each chapter, and the notes at the end. His notes are diversified (textual, doctrinal, polemical, and practical), and form almost a running commentary. They are of various origin: many are taken from Pellicanus, and quite a number are original. His anti-papal notes are very striking; that on Matt. xvi. ("I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock, etc.") reads, "That is, as saith St. Austin, upon the confession which thou hast made, knowledgeing me to be Christ, the Son of the living God, I will build my congregation or Church;" that on xxv. ("And the wise answered, Not so lest there be not enough, etc."). "Note here that their own good works sufficed not for themselves, and therefore remained none to be distributed unto their fellows." The title of the Apocrypha reads, The volume of the bokes called Apocrypha conteyned in the comen translation in Latyne, which are not found in the Hebreue, nor in the Chalde. He supplies the prayer of Manasses, omitted by Coverdale, from the French version of Olivetan; and he protests, in the language of the same writer, against their reception as an inspired collection. The peculiarities of the version, as distinguished from Tyndale's and Coverdale's, cannot be illustrated here; but an idea of it may be conveyed by two or three of its characteristic notes. "Selah." This word, after Rabbi Kimhi, was a sign or token of lifting up the voice, and also a monition and advertisement to enforce the thought and mind earnestly to give heed to the meaning of the verse unto which it is added. Some will that it signifies perpetually or verily." Messiah. It signifieth anointed. Jesus Christ was a sign or token of lifting up the voice, and every change in the Old Testament may be traced to the interference of the inquisitor-general, it was stopped, and had to be redone (see date of April 1539) in London. This handsome folio, on account of its size, is the Great Bible, not Cranmer's, as it is sometimes loosely called. Its title runs: The Byble in Englyshe, that is to saye, the content of all the Holy Scripture, bothe of the Olde and Newe testament, truly translated after the versie of the Hebrue and Greke textes, by the dylygent studye of dyuerse excellent learned men, expert in the forsayde tonges. Printed by Rychard Graffon & Edwarde Witchesbur. Cum privilegio ad imprimentum solam. 1539.

These "dyuerse excellent learned men" appear to have been the works of Münster and Erasmus. The elaborate frontispiece of this Bible is said to have been designed by Iolbein. It is the text of Matthew, revised, or Coverdale's revision of Tyndale and of his own Bible; and he was so little attached to that, that (e.g., in Isa. liii.) he corrects it very unequal. His rendering is frequently in servile imitation of the Vulgate, on which he seems to have wholly relied in the Old Testament; e.g., (Gen. i. 2) "the Spirit of God was borne upon" (ferebatur); (i. 7) "and so it was doon" (factum est); "bereth seed" (afferentem). In the New Testament, on the other hand, both the number and quality of his renderings proclaim the finished Grecian; and a large proportion of them are retained in the Authorized Version. Matt. i. 25 (Matthew's "Till short had brought forth her first borne sonne") he renders "till at last she had brought forth her first borne sonne;" xxii. 12 ("he was even speechless") is changed into "had never a word to say;" and xxii. 34 ("put the Sadducees to silence") into "stopped the Sadducees mouth." In his studious endeavor to find Saxon terms, he gave us (1 John ii. 1) "spokesman" for "advocate," and (at ii. 2) coined "mercystock" as the equivalent of Donatikos, and in place of Tyndale's and Coverdale's "he it is that obtaineth grace for us." To his regard for the Greek article are due the renderings (John i. 9), "that was the true light which ... coming." (i. 23) "I am a voice of one crying." (i. 25) "Art thou the prophet?" Among the many phrases introduced by him, and retained in the Authorized Version, are, (Matt. xiii. 58) "because of their unbelief," (xviii. 12) "ninety and nine," (xxv. 35) "a stranger," (xxvi. 63) "Ye have a watch," (Gal. iv. 20) "I stand in doubt of you," (vi. 18) "the Israel of God." In 1651 his Old Testament appeared in the folio Bible, revised by Becker, and printed by Jhon Day. After that period it fell into neglect. The Epistles in this edition, as well as Matthew's Bible, follow the order of the Authorized Version as far as Philemon, after which come the Epistles of John, Hebrews, First and Second Peter, James, and Jude.

7. The Great Bible.—Tyndale's and Matthew's Bibles were for ecclesiastical reasons, Coverdale's, on account of its inaccuracy, not acceptable to Cranwell, at whose instance and charge the latter was directed to produce a new edition on more critical principles. Coverdale, accompanied by Grafton, repaired for that purpose to Paris (1538), where better paper and more skilful printing were to be had; and the work proceeded satisfactorily at the press of Regnault, until by the interference of the inquisitor-general, it was stopped, and had to be redone (see date of April 1539) in London. This handsome folio, on account of its size, is the Great Bible, not Cranmer's, as it is sometimes loosely called. Its title runs: The Byble in Englyshe, that is to saye, the content of all the Holy Scripture, bothe of the Olde and Newe testament, truly translated after the versie of the Hebrue and Greke textes, by the dylygent studye of dyuerse excellent learned men, expert in the forsayde tonges. Printed by Rychard Graffon & Edwarde Witchesbur. Cum privilegio ad imprimentum solam. 1539.

The "dyuerse excellent learned men" appear to have been the works of Münster and Erasmus. The elaborate frontispiece of this Bible is said to have been designed by Iolbein. It is the text of Matthew, revised, or Coverdale's revision of Tyndale and of his own Bible; and he was so little attached to that, that (e.g., in Isa. liii.) he corrects it very unequal. His rendering is frequently in servile imitation of the Vulgate, on which he seems to have wholly relied in the Old Testament; e.g., (Gen. i. 2) "the Spirit of God was borne upon" (ferebatur).
table before me against mine enemies: thou hast anointed my head with oil, and filled my cup full; all exhibiting independent and superior scholarship, which likewise distinguish the notes for which the Genevan Testament is famous, and most of which were put into the edition of 1560. These notes are mostly original, or selected from Calvin and Beza, and treat of theology, history, geography, etc.; some are also inferential. This Testament is the first English Testament with verse division. The whole Bible of 1560 is a model of excellence, scholarly precision, and magnificence; and the translators were indebted in the Old Testament to Pagninus, Münster, and Leo Judae. In the New Testament the force of the Greek particles ὡς, κατα, etc., is uniformly attended to. It was finished and published April, 1560, and printed by Rowland Hall. It is known also as the Breeches Bible, from the rendering of Gen. iii. 7. They sewed fig-leaves together, and made themselves breaches. It was printed — at the expense of the English congregation at Geneva, of which John Bodley (father of Sir Thomas, the founder of the Bodleian Library at Oxford) was a generous member — in quarter and became very popular, more than one hundred and thirty editions having been published, the last in 1644, and the Authorized Version, with the Genevan notes, in 1715. Peculiar and novel features were, the attempted restoration of the original form of Hebrew names, the omission of St. Paul from the title of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the use of Italic letters for supplemental words, the substitution of biblical events and the names of reformers for the names of saints in the Calendar, and the entire omission of the Apocrypha. The Anglo-Genevan edition of the New Testament of 1570, by Lawrence Tomson, one of the best linguists of the day, introduced many changes, especially in the rendering of the article by that (e.g., John i. 1, 4, 5, 9, 14, etc.), and the notes, which, though more numerous, are less pithy than the old ones. The first Bible printed in Scotland (1570) is an exact reprint of the Genevan of 1561.

9. The Bishops'. — The superior merits of the Genevan Bible, its great popularity, and the general dissatisfaction with the Great Bible, induced Archbishop Parker to make preparations for a new edition under church authority, leading to a revision of that Bible by the originals with the aid of Pagninus and Minster, etc., temperate annotations, the marking of unedifying portions, and the use, where required, of nobler forms of expression. Some of his episcopal coadjutors held extraordinary views (e.g., Bishops Guest, Cox, and Sandys), and the archbishop exercised accordingly a wise discretion in the assigning of the several books. The revision — on which not less than eight bishops were engaged (hence its name), as well as several deans and professors — was completed, and the Bible published in a hand-some folio, on good paper, and superbly printed, in 1568, 1569, 1570, 1571 (New Testament), and 1572. It contains a vast amount of excellent prefatory and introductory matter, among it the preface by the archbishop, and Cranmer's prologue, and is highly ornamented, some of the ornaments of very dappled tinsel, but it is of unequal merit; the different books in the edition of 1568 being qualitatively unequal, and the whole edition of 1572 greatly superior to
the former. That of 1572 is the basis of the Authorized Version. The critical helps available to the Genevan translators were used by the translators of the Bishops’ Bible; and, while the influence of the Genevan Version on this is very pronounced, the original was diligently consulted. The critical examination of Isa. liii. by Professor Westcott yields the result, that, of twenty-one corrections, seven are due to the Genevan, five agree with Fagin’s, three with Castalio’s, two with the Vulgate, one with Munster, one is linguistic, and three are apparently original. These last are the omission (lili. 3) of “Yes, he was . . . regarded him not,” and (lili. 4) of “and punished,” and the correction (lili. 4) of “infirmities” into “infants.” In Job xix. 28 the Bishops’ of 1568 brings the new rendering, “he shall raise up at the latter day them that lie in the dust.” Twenty-nine passages in the New Testament of 1568, faulty by Lawrence as incorrect, were, for the most part, as corrected by him, received in the Authorized Version, and into Latin fathers text of the Authorized Version. The examination of Eph. iv. 7–16 (by Westcott) in the Great Bible of 1550, and the Bishops’, shows, that, among twenty-six changes, seventeen are new, nine being due to the Genevan, and the remains the result of close and thoughtful reference to the Greek. The independence of the revision is evident in that only four of the new changes agree with Beza, while nine go against him. But, in spite of many excellencies, the Bishops’ Bible was the least successful of all the English versions. As peculiar to this Bible appear the attempted classification of the books of the Bible into legal, historical, sapiential, and prophetic (with the curious result that the Gospels, the Catholic Epistles, and those to Titus, Philemon, and the Hebrews, are described as legal, the other Pauline Epistles as sapiential, the Acts alone as historical, and Revelation as prophetic), the indication of ostracized portions, and, in one edition, two versions of the Psalter (Matthew’s and the new).

10. The Rheims and Douay. — William Allen, Gregory Martin, and Richard Bristow were the chief promoters of this extraordinary version, which schemes for the Vulgate, from the year 1582, not only equal authority with the original Scriptures, but superior, reasoning thus: As a rule, the Latin agrees with the Greek; when it differs from the common Greek text, it agrees with some copy, “as may be seen in Stephens’s margin,” and the adversaries frequently concede the superiority of the marginal readings; when the Greek goes against the Latin, quotations from the Greek fathers are sure to sustain it, and, where these fail, conjecture may come in to adapt the Greek to the Latin; and, where conjecture and the Greek fathers fail, the Latin fathers are almost sure to sustain the Vulgate, and, if their readings should differ, the cause is to be sought in “the great dieriesit and multitude” of the Latin copies. Admit these principles, and the superiority of the text of the Vulgate to the Greek text is established.

I am undecided whether the actual translation of the Rheims New Testament agrees or conflicts with the expressed purpose of its authors; for their text, especially in the correct use of the article, often agrees with the Greek, and in spite of their deification of the Vulgate, even as authorized by the Council of Trent, and their ceaseless fulminations (in the notes) against heretics, they are greatly indebted to the Genevan mouthpiece, the Genevan Version, the Bishops’ Bible, and to Wiclif. The New Testament appeared in 1582, at Rheims, and the Old Testament in 1609, at Douay. The production is very scholarly, in fact, equal to that of any version extant at the time, and its detractors, bent on useless as a translation. It is designed literally, and its English so utterly unenglish, that it might pass for Latin; e.g., (Matt. i. 17) “transmigration of Babylom,” (vi. 11) “supersubstantial bread,” (xvii. 20) “what permutation,” (Mark v. 36) “archbishop,” (Luke xxi. 7) “the day of the Azymes . . . the pasche,” (John vii. 5) “Sceneopgia was at hand,” (Rom. i. 30) “odible to God,” (1 Cor. x. 11) “written to our correction,” (xi. 4) “dishonesteth his head,” (Phil. ii. 7) “exinanited himself,” (Phil. iv. 6) “evidently the present word,” (Heb. vi. 5) “grace commodious,” (ix. 28) “examples of the cestials,” (xiii. 16) “God is promerited,” (Jas. iii. 4) “with a little sterna whither the violence of the director will,” (iii. 6) “the wheels of our natiuty,” (1 John iv. 5) “every spirit that dissolueth Jesus,” (Rev. xxii. 14) “blessed are they that washed their stoles.” This new beatitude may have been necessary in certain monasteries, but cannot be accepted by the Latin Church; for many copies of the Vulgate add, “in sanguine Agni.” The version is nevertheless meritorious in other respects, notably in the uniformity of its renderings (e.g., of Amen, Rabbi, charity, multitude, work); but not a word of commendation can be said of the notes, which are truly savage. Lord Bacon liked this version. It is proper to add that the modern editions are less unenglish and less furious. See Vulgate New Testament with the Douay Version of 1588, London, 1851. See also below in Miscellaneous.

11. The Authorized Version. — At the Hampton Court Conference (1604) the demand of Reindols for a new translation was really the starting-point which eventuated, mainly through the king’s dislike (pretended or real) of the Authorized Version, the work (in all) of fifty-four scholars (forty-seven on the list), divided into six companies, of which two met at Westminster, two at Oxford, and two at Cambridge, for the space of three years; after which six men, two from each place, met in London to superintend the publication. Bishop, Bishop of Winchester, who wrote the arguments of the several books, and Dr. Miles Smith, who wrote the noble preface, were the final correctors. The preface states, among many other matters, that their object was to make of many good translations a principal good one, to avoid extremes, and produce uniformity of rendering. “Never was a great enterprise like the production of our Authorized Version, carried out with less knowledge handed down to posterity of the labourers, their method, and order of working” (Scriverer, Introd. to Cambridge Paragraph Bible). It was published in 1611; and a number of years elapsed before its intrinsic superiority and merits drove all other English translations out of the field. Taken as a whole, it is the best and most truly English version. Couched in noble language, it abounds in felicities. It is musical, dramatic, and
even tragical. It is, in turn, pathetic and sublime, and has, withal, a directness and force which commend it to all classes and conditions of men. But it is far from perfect; and wherein, in the opinion of many of its most ardent admirers, it should be made to conform more thoroughly and consistently with the original Scriptures remains to be briefly indicated under the following heads, preparatory to the Anglo-American revision:—

(1) The critical apparatus at the command of the translators of King James's Version was that already noticed in the earlier portions of this article, to which must be added, for the Old Testament, the Latin translations of the Hebrew by Aurius Montanus (1572) and Tremellius (extended to the Apocrypha by his son-in-law, Francis Junius, 1579). They had likewise the translation of the Syriac New Testament by Tremellius, and of the Greek by Theodore Beza (Louden, 1593, 1597). For the Greek text of the New Testament they had Beza's edition of 1589, and the third edition of Stephens, with this result (following from the critical value, or rather want of value, of those Testaments), that many readings of the Authorized Version are due to the Latin manuscript, and that the Greek text they used, in more than a thousand cases, requires to be corrected by what is now known to be the true text (Professor Abbot's Paper in Anglo-American Bible Revision, New York, 1879). Of these existing critical versions (i.e., those made directly from the original) they had Luther, the Genevan-French (1587-88), the Italian by Diodati (1607), and the Spanish by C. Reydan (1599), and Valera's (1602).

(2) The improvements made upon former English versions, and their sources. — A critical examination of Isa. liii. shows, that, of forty-nine changes, about seven-eighths are due to the Genevan version, two to Tremellius, two to Pagninus, that the Genevan is abandoned three times, and one rendering is independent (Westcott); to which I would add, that, of sixty-five words exclusive of Amen (Matthew the sixty-fivewords), the Saxon-English of the Authorized Version are original, and in thirteen places one rendering is independent (Westcott); to "Rock of ages," etc. The Saxon-English of the Authorized Version is consistent with fidelity; 2. To be expressed, if possible, in the language of the Authorized and earlier English versions; 3. To be twice revised; 4. The text to be adopted to be that sustained by preponderating evidence, and the changes to be noted in the margin; 5. Textual changes to be made by simple majorities on the first revision, by two-thirds on the second; 6. The voting on changes causing discussion to be deferred to the next meeting, if required by one-third of the revisers present; 7. Headings of chapters, pages, paragraphs, Italics, and punctuation to be revised; 8. Reference, when desirable, to other experts, at home or abroad, for their opinion. The principles regulating the
American co-operation are substantially as follows:— 'The English revisers to send their revision to the American revisers, to consider the American suggestions, and patristic quotations were received, and diligently compared by competent experts, and their united testimony required for the adoption of any, even the minutest, integral portion of the sacred volume. The readers of the new revision have the undoubted assurance that the Greek text from which it has been translated has been verified, as far as human learning and fidelity could verify it, as the word of God. What the revisers rejected from the text had been added by careless or designing transcribers, what they received into it had been omitted by them. No version rests on a purer text.

(2) Its translation is a marvel for fidelity, accuracy, elegance, purity of idiom, and harmony of expression. Some of its noblest features depend for their full appreciation on the publication of the Old Testament. The changes introduced are fivefold: 1. Those required by change of reading in the Greek text; e.g., (1 Pet. ii. 21) "Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example." 2. Where the Authorized Version appeared to be incorrect; e.g., (1 Cor. xi. 34) "That your coming together be not unto judgment." 3. The removal of ambiguous or obscure renderings; e.g., (Matt. xvi. 23) "Thou art a stumbling block unto me." 4. The removal of inconsistent renderings; e.g., (1 Cor. xxvii. 28) "For He put all things in subjection, yet not unto judgment." 5. Changes made necessary by consequence (see Preface). The grammatical inaccuracies of the Authorized Version have been removed; e.g., (Matt. xii. 23) "The Christ;" (1 Tim. iv. 10) "a root of all evil;" (Acts xix. 2) "did ye receive . . . when ye believed?" (v. 30) "whom ye slew, hanging him on a tree;" (Matt. xxiv. 19) "baptizing them into the name;" (Rom. viii. 17) "the mind of the flesh . . . the mind of the Spirit;" (Matt. xxvii. 44) "cast upon him the same reproach." Such archaisms as "asoon," "offend," "scrip," "an eight days," "highest room," "lewd," "carriages," "profited," "proper," etc., used in senses now unintelligible, have been corrected by proper words. Consonants have been introduced in the rendering of proper names by the uniform preservation of one word for the same person or place.

Technical expressions, such as "deputy," "chief of Asia," "executioner," and "chamberlain," have been corrected by more appropriate terms. Some improvements furnish them with copies of the revision in its final form before publication, and to allow them to present in an appendix remaining differences of reading and rendering of importance not adopted by the English revisers. The result, thus far, of this harmonious union and cooperation, is the Revised New Testament, which is unquestionably a most faithful and noble English version, and equal to any version of the sacred original, for the following reasons:—

(1) Its text, i.e., the Greek, is the purest extant, based on the authority of documentary evidence without deference to any printed text of modern times; which imports that only the most ancient and authentic manuscripts, versions, and patristic quotations were received, and diligently compared by competent experts, and their united testimony required for the adoption of any, even the minutest, integral portion of the sacred volume. The readers of the new revision have the undoubted assurance that the Greek text from which it has been translated has been verified, as far as human learning and fidelity could verify it, as the word of God. What the revisers rejected from the text had been added by careless or designing transcribers, what they received into it had been omitted by them. No version rests on a purer text.

(2) Its translation is a marvel for fidelity, accuracy, elegance, purity of idiom, and harmony of expression. Some of its noblest features depend for their full appreciation on the publication of the Old Testament. The changes introduced are fivefold: 1. Those required by change of reading in the Greek text; e.g., (1 Pet. ii. 21) "Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example." 2. Where the Authorized Version appeared to be incorrect; e.g., (1 Cor. xi. 34) "That your coming together be not unto judgment." 3. The removal of ambiguous or obscure renderings; e.g., (Matt. xvi. 23) "Thou art a stumbling block unto me." 4. The removal of inconsistent renderings; e.g., (1 Cor. xxvii. 28) "For He put all things in subjection, yet not unto judgment." 5. Changes made necessary by consequence (see Preface). The grammatical inaccuracies of the Authorized Version have been removed; e.g., (Matt. xii. 23) "The Christ;" (1 Tim. iv. 10) "a root of all evil;" (Acts xix. 2) "did ye receive . . . when ye believed?" (v. 30) "whom ye slew, hanging him on a tree;" (Matt. xxiv. 19) "baptizing them into the name;" (Rom. viii. 17) "the mind of the flesh . . . the mind of the Spirit;" (Matt. xxvii. 44) "cast upon him the same reproach." Such archaisms as "asoon," "offend," "scrip," "an eight days," "highest room," "lewd," "carriages," "profited," "proper," etc., used in senses now unintelligible, have been corrected by proper words. Consonants have been introduced in the rendering of proper names by the uniform preservation of one word for the same person or place.

Technical expressions, such as "deputy," "chief of Asia," "executioner," and "chamberlain," have been corrected by more appropriate terms. Some improvements furnish them with copies of the revision in its final form before publication, and to allow them to present in an appendix remaining differences of reading and rendering of importance not adopted by the English revisers. The result, thus far, of this harmonious union and cooperation, is the Revised New Testament, which is unquestionably a most faithful and noble English version, and equal to any version of the sacred original, for the following reasons:—

(1) Its text, i.e., the Greek, is the purest extant, based on the authority of documentary evidence without deference to any printed text of modern times; which imports that only the most ancient and authentic manuscripts, versions, and patristic quotations were received, and diligently compared by competent experts, and their united testimony required for the adoption of any, even the minutest, integral portion of the sacred volume. The readers of the new revision have the undoubted assurance that the Greek text from which it has been translated has been verified, as far as human learning and fidelity could verify it, as the word of God. What the revisers rejected from the text had been added by careless or designing transcribers, what they received into it had been omitted by them. No version rests on a purer text.

(2) Its translation is a marvel for fidelity, accuracy, elegance, purity of idiom, and harmony of expression. Some of its noblest features depend for their full appreciation on the publication of the Old Testament. The changes introduced are fivefold: 1. Those required by change of reading in the Greek text; e.g., (1 Pet. ii. 21) "Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example." 2. Where the Authorized Version appeared to be incorrect; e.g., (1 Cor. xi. 34) "That your coming together be not unto judgment." 3. The removal of ambiguous or obscure renderings; e.g., (Matt. xvi. 23) "Thou art a stumbling block unto me." 4. The removal of inconsistent renderings; e.g., (1 Cor. xxvii. 28) "For He put all things in subjection, yet not unto judgment." 5. Changes made necessary by consequence (see Preface). The grammatical inaccuracies of the Authorized Version have been removed; e.g., (Matt. xii. 23) "The Christ;" (1 Tim. iv. 10) "a root of all evil;" (Acts xix. 2) "did ye receive . . . when ye believed?" (v. 30) "whom ye slew, hanging him on a tree;" (Matt. xxiv. 19) "baptizing them into the name;" (Rom. viii. 17) "the mind of the flesh . . . the mind of the Spirit;" (Matt. xxvii. 44) "cast upon him the same reproach." Such archaisms as "asoon," "offend," "scrip," "an eight days," "highest room," "lewd," "carriages," "profited," "proper," etc., used in senses now unintelligible, have been corrected by proper words. Consonants have been introduced in the rendering of proper names by the uniform preservation of one word for the same person or place.

Technical expressions, such as "deputy," "chief of Asia," "executioner," and "chamberlain," have been corrected by more appropriate terms. Some improvements furnish them with copies of the revision in its final form before publication, and to allow them to present in an appendix remaining differences of reading and rendering of importance not adopted by the English revisers. The result, thus far, of this harmonious union and cooperation, is the Revised New Testament, which is unquestionably a most faithful and noble English version, and equal to any version of the sacred original, for the following reasons:—

(1) Its text, i.e., the Greek, is the purest extant, based on the authority of documentary evidence without deference to any printed text of modern times; which imports that only the most ancient and authentic manuscripts, versions, and patristic quotations were received, and diligently compared by competent experts, and their united testimony required for the adoption of any, even the minutest, integral portion of the sacred volume. The readers of the new revision have the undoubted assurance that the Greek text from which it has been translated has been verified, as far as human learning and fidelity could verify it, as the word of God. What the revisers rejected from the text had been added by careless or designing transcribers, what they received into it had been omitted by them. No version rests on a purer text.

(2) Its translation is a marvel for fidelity, accuracy, elegance, purity of idiom, and harmony of expression. Some of its noblest features depend for their full appreciation on the publication of the Old Testament. The changes introduced are fivefold: 1. Those required by change of reading in the Greek text; e.g., (1 Pet. ii. 21) "Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example." 2. Where the Authorized Version appeared to be incorrect; e.g., (1 Cor. xi. 34) "That your coming together be not unto judgment." 3. The removal of ambiguous or obscure renderings; e.g., (Matt. xvi. 23) "Thou art a stumbling block unto me." 4. The removal of inconsistent renderings; e.g., (1 Cor. xxvii. 28) "For He put all things in subjection, yet not unto judgment." 5. Changes made necessary by consequence (see Preface). The grammatical inaccuracies of the Authorized Version have been removed; e.g., (Matt. xii. 23) "The Christ;" (1 Tim. iv. 10) "a root of all evil;" (Acts xix. 2) "did ye receive . . . when ye believed?" (v. 30) "whom ye slew, hanging him on a tree;" (Matt. xxiv. 19) "baptizing them into the name;" (Rom. viii. 17) "the mind of the flesh . . . the mind of the Spirit;" (Matt. xxvii. 44) "cast upon him the same reproach." Such archaisms as "asoon," "offend," "scrip," "an eight days," "highest room," "lewd," "carriages," "profited," "proper," etc., used in senses now unintelligible, have been corrected by proper words. Consonants have been introduced in the rendering of proper names by the uniform preservation of one word for the same person or place.
utterly undignified, if not vulgar and profane, production. The edition of the Authorized Version, containing for the first time the chronological dates (see Authorized Version) is known as Archbishop Tenison’s of 1701. The Cambridge edition of the Bible by Dr. Paris (1782) and the Oxford edition by Dr. Blayney (1789) are important: the latter, on account of its great accuracy, is regarded as the standard in England. Dr. Scrivener’s Cambridge Paragraph Bible (1873) is said to be the most accurately edited in the language. The Rheims New Testament was printed in a second edition, 1600, in a third at Douay, in 1621, and in a fourth, probably at Rouen, in 1633. The Old Testament appeared in a second edition in 1635. Among the later Roman-Catholic versions are prominent: (1) New’s New Testament, 1719 (Dublin?); a vast improvement on the Rheims and Douay in tone and English; (2) Wheaton’s New Testament, 1730–33 (Douay?); (3) Troy’s Bible, Dublin, 1816, with very savage notes; (4) The Holy Bible, Dublin and London, 1825, in better English, but a very corrupt text; (5) A New Version of the Four Gospels by a Catholic Dr. Lin- gan, 1816, with the help of the Hebrew text and the account disparaged by Roman-Catholic writers, notably by Cardinal Wiseman.


ENNOBIUS, Magnus Felix, b. at Arles about 473; d. at Pavia, July 17, 521; belonged to a distinguished but poor Gallic family; lost his parents very early, and was educated at Milan by an aunt, who died 499, and left him nearly destitute. Having made a rich match, he lived, as it seems, only to do good himself, when a severe sickness awakened him to serious reflections. His wife entered a nunnery, and he was ordained a deacon; as such, he accompanied Bishop Epiphanius of Pavia on his mission to the Burgundian King Gundeobaud (494), and, two years later on, he distinguished himself in Rome by an apology for Pope Symmachus and a panegyric of Theodic; by Pope Hormisdas he was made Bishop of Pavia, and as such he was twice sent as ambassador to Constantinople (515 and 517). His works (consisting of some poems, a number of letters, the panegyric of Theodic, the defence of Symmachus, a life of Bishop Epiphanius, etc.) were first printed at Basel, 1569, Paris, 1611, in Migne, Patr. Lat., vol. 63; best editions by Hartel, Vienna, 1882, and Vogel, Berlin, 1885. They have no aesthetical merits, and only small historical interest: they show that in theology he was a semi-pelagian, and with respect to church-polity an ardent champion of the Papal supremacy. He was the first who addressed the Bishop of Rome as papa.

ENOC (initiator, or initiated). There are several of this name mentioned in the Old Testament (Gen. iv. 17, and, in the Hebrew text, xxvi. 4, xvi. 9; and Exod. vi. 14); but the only one of any interest is the son of Jared and the father of Methusaleh (Gen. v. 18, 21–24). He “walked with God,” a phrase expressive of constant companionship, an undisturbed, intimate intercourse with God; and so, at the age of three hundred and sixty-five years (very young for an antediluvian), suddenly he was not, for God took him. His disappearance, was, in the antediluvian age, the striking evidence of immortality, just as Elijah’s was to his age, and Christ’s resurrection is to us. Men may have looked for him, as they did subsequently for Elijah (2 Kings ii. 16), but vainly. He had gone, not to return. He had been translated. In the absence of biblical information, speculation has been active. According to the majority of the rabbins and the fathers he was taken to paradise, although some put him in heaven, and others in the seventh heaven. A parallel to Enoch’s translation will be that of the saints who are alive at the second coming of Christ (1 Thess. iv. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 51). In the Epistle to the Hebrews, Enoch’s walk with God is regarded as a triumph of faith (Heb. xi. 5).

Tradition has made of Enoch not only a preacher of repentance, and prophet of judgment, which indeed is very likely, but also (as “Enoch” may mean the initiated) a sage acquainted with divine secrets by reason of his walk with God, the transmitter of the true word in contradistinction to the knowledge which demons had brought into the world, and the inventor of writing and the sciences, particularly astronomy. Finally, in the century before Christ, a book was attributed to him, in which all the knowledge then attained about God, nature, and history, was by a fiction transferred to him. A quotation is made from it in Jude 14. See Enoch, Book of, of the Old Testament, and A. Dillmann, Das Buch Henoch, Leipzig, 1853. Among the Arabs, Enoch or Idris (the learned), as he is more commonly called, plays the rôle of a medium of the higher knowledge and science.

The heathen myths of the assumption of Hercules, Romulus, and others, are not in point; because the ground for the translation of Enoch was his relations with God, while the legends rest upon a naturalistic conception of divinity, which merges the gods with the highest human development. Much nearer to the biblical account is the Babylonian Xisuthrus in the history of Berossus, who indeed corresponds to Noah, but
who was after the flood translated, and was sought
for until his voice was heard announcing, that, on
account of his piety, he had been removed to dwell among the gods. In the cuneiform inscrip-
tions he is called Ardrakhasis, and was with his
wife taken away to live as the gods in a remote
place at the mouth of the rivers. [See George
Smith: The Chaldean Account of Genesis, ed.
Sayce, pp. 288, 300.] Another supposed parallel
to the Bible Enoch is King Annakos, or Nam
kos, who is said to have lived three hundred years
before the Deukalion flood, and to have prophes-
yed with tears the overthrow of the race after
his death. But this story comes through Zenob-
bius (200 A.D.), who borrowed freely from Didy-
nus of Alexandria (30 A.D.); and it is therefore
extremely probable, as the similarity of names
would itself indicate, that the story is really
derived from Jewish sources.

An endeavor has been made to identify Enoch
with the Latin Janus, the god of the new year,
because the year has 365 days, and he had 365
days; but it remains only an endeavor. See the
commentaries and Bible histories and Bible dic-
tionaries upon Enoch; [Baring-Gould: Legends
of the Patriarchs and Prophets, American reprint,
N.Y., pp. 85—91].

ENTHUSIASM (from ἐνθυσσω, filled or inspired
by God) is an intense moral impulse or all-
engrossing temper of mind. There is an enthu-
siasm for popular freedom and for art, for the
emancipation of the slaves and for conquest. The
term as applied to religion designates both a
noble temper of mind and moral fervor (expressed
by the apostle as a „being zealously affected in
a good cause“), and also a misdirected and even
destructive intensity of feeling.

The distinction between genuine and morbid
enthusiasm will often depend upon the nice dis-
crimination of a keen judgment, or the moral
stand-point of the critic, as in the case of that
ridicule which is by some applied to all religious
workers or philanthropists who have undergone
hardship, or even death, in the service and for the
benefit of others; as in the case of monasticism,
and of the apostles on the Day of Pentecost, who
were said by some to be drunken (Acts ii.13).

Enthusiasm is the quality without which the
best in any department cannot be reached, nor
the largest amount of results achieved. It is also
a quality, which, controlled by ignorance, or mis-
application, although conscientiously it may be, may
work great harm.

In the better sense of the term, our Lord was
the highest illustration of enthusiasm. His soul
was possessed with overwhelming affection for
men, and an intense impulse to help them. The
apostles were enthusiasts in a good sense; being
constrained by an overwhelming desire to preach
the gospel, and ready to show it by suffering and
death. The early monks, St. Francis of Assisi,
Dominitius, Hus, the Reformers, the early Method-
istas, and the present missionaries in foreign
lands, are also examples of religious enthusiasm. He-
then religious have had their enthusiasts, as well
as the Christian.

Christian enthusiasm in the good sense is de-

crived from two motives,—love for men (brought
out in a strong way by the author of Ecc.
Homo) and love for Christ. The New Testament
combines both these moti

I

In the bad sense, enthusiasm is almost synon-
ymous with fanaticism, and enthusiasts with
zealots. It is fervor of soul drawn from wrong
principles, founded on substitutes for the truth, and
applied to wrong ends. Neither selfish nor impure
motives necessarily prevail in such a temper of
mind, and zeal of activity. Such enthusiasm may
proceed from a sincere desire to glorify God. It
substitutes fancies for the truth, and in its last
stages the disorder of the mind becomes mental
insanity. Warburton defines enthusiasm in this
second sense as that „temper of mind in which
the imagination has got the better of the judg-
ment“ (Div. Leg., V., Appendix).

The term „enthusiasts“ has also had a technical
sense, as in the Elizabethan period. Jewel, Rogers
(Thirty-nine Articles, p. 158, Parker Soc. ed.),
and others speak of Enthusiasts as they do of
Anabaptists. During the Commonwealth period,
and afterwards, the term was frequently applied
to the Puritans in a tone of depreciation, as
notably by Robert South, who preached a special
sermon on the subject, „Enthusiasts not led by
the Spirit of God,“ meaning by enthusiasts the
Puritans. See Isaac Taylor: Natural Hist.
of Enthusiasm, 9th ed., Lond., 1843.

ENZINAS, Francisco de (Dryander, Duchesne,
Van Eyck, Eichman, translations of the Spanish
name „oakman“), b. at Burgos, 1520; d. at
Geneva, 1570; studied in Italy, afterwards in
Louvain and Wittenberg; embraced the Reform-
ation; was arrested at Brussels (1543), escaped
to England (1545), and lived afterwards on the Conti-
nent,—at Strassburg, Basel, and Geneva. He
translated the New Testament into Spanish, and
dedicated it to Charles V. His brother, Jacques
de Enzinas, also embraced Protestantism, and was
burnt at the stake in Italy, 1546.

EON, or EUDO DE STELLA, an enthusiast in
the middle of the twelfth century, and probably
connected with the Cathari; was b. in Bretagne,
and was, by the words which he once heard in the
church („per eum qui venturus est iudicature vives
et mortuos“), led to believe that he („Eon“) was
meant by that eum. Preaching, prophesying, and
working miracles, he roved about in France,
and much people gathered around him, and were
seduced by him. In 1145 the papal legate, Cardi-
nal Albericus of Ostia, preached against him at
Nantes; then Archbishop Hugo of Rouen wrote
a book against him, Dognatum christianae fidei
Libri Tres (found in Bibl. Patr. Max., Lyons, T.
XXII.); and finally troops were sent against him.
Severa of his adherents were burnt in the diocese
of Alet, while he himself retreated into Guyenne.
In 1148 he appeared in Champagne, but was
cought, together with a number of his disciples.
When placed before the synod of Rheims, and
asked by Pope Eugenius III. who he was, he an-
swered, „Is qui venturus est iudicare vives et
mortuos.“ The synod declared him crazy, and
ordered him shut up in a dungeon: his followers
were burnt, and very soon all trace of his sect dis-
appeared.

C. SCHMIDT.
EON. See ERA, Gnosticism.

EPAAON, The Council of, was held in 517 in a town of Burgundy whose site cannot be identified any more. It was called by Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, and Viventiolus, Bishop of Lyons, and attended by twenty-four bishops. On Sept. 14, 517, they subscribed forty canons, mostly of a disciplinary character, regulating the relations of bishops, priests, and monks. Canon 4 forbids bishops, priests, and deacons to keep hawks or dogs for hunting; canon 8 forbids an abbot to reside over two monasteries; canons 15, 16, 29, and 33 concern heretics, and forbid Catholic clergymen to eat at the same table with a heretic, etc.; canon 26 forbids any altar not of stone to be consecrated with chasub, etc. See LABBE: Dissertatio philosophica de Concilio Epanonensi; MANSI: Conc. Coll., VIII. 319-342, 347-372, 555-574.

EPARCHY (ἐπαρχία) denoted originally a merely political division, being the official administrative name of a province. It consisted of counties, and formed part of a diocese. This scheme of secular administration was followed by the organization of the church; so that the head of a county community became a bishop, the head of an eparchy a metropolitan, and the head of a diocese a patriarch. At the time of the Council of Nicea (325) this organization and its terminology were fully developed.

EPHESIANS, Epistle to the. See PAUL.

EPHESUS, renowned as a seat of heathen rites, and conspicuous in the history of early Christianity, was an opulent city on the western coast of Asia Minor. It was advantageously situated on the fertile banks of the Cayster, and built partly on the plain, and partly on the hills, of which Prion and Coressus were the two principal ones. It was on the direct road to Sardis. To the south of it, on the Maeander, lay Miletus; at an equal distance to the north, Smyrna, on the Hermus. The city was colonized as early as the eleventh century, by Androclus, the son of the Athenian king, Codrus. It soon became famous as a mart and hostelry, the harbor affording ample shelter for ships. Asiatic elements mixed on its streets with Greek influences, and colored the social life. The city came successively under the rule of Persians, Macedonians, and the Romans. In 262 A.D. it was destroyed by the Goths. Although rebuilt, it never regained its former glory. The ravages of time and the ruthlessness of man have secured its total desolation. A squallid village, containing only twenty regular inhabitants (Guhl: Ephesiaca, Berlin, 1843; Falkener: Ephesus and the Temple of Diana, Lond., 1862; Wood: Discoveries in Ephesus, London and Boston, 1877; Life of St. Paul, ii. 80 sqq.), the women of the city contributing their ornaments. The structure was erected on a magnificent scale, and when completed was regarded as the most perfect work of Ionic architecture. The priestesses that ministered at the fane were virgins, and the priests celibates. When the Goths ravaged the city (262 A.D.), they spared not the temple. Some of its graceful columns are said to be incorporated in the Church of St. Sophia. But the very site of the magnificent structure was completely obliterated by the detritus of the river, and remained a mystery until the important discoveries of Mr. J. T. Wood (1863-74). Its dimensions were four hundred and twenty-five by two hundred and twenty feet. The roof was sustained by a hundred and twenty-seven columns sixty feet high.

Ephesus and the Christian Church. — The city early became one of the most conspicuous scenes of apostolic labors. The Church was distinguished by having St. Paul for its founder, St. John for its counselor, and Timothy for its bishop. To it St. Paul addressed one of his Epistles, which abounds in references to the temple and theatre of the city. The congregation was fully organized at an early date, as is evident, from the presbyters who bade Paul farewell at Miletus (Acts xx. 24 sqq.), and its mention as the first among the churches of Asia Minor (Rev. ii. 1). Here St. John spent his last years (Eusebius), and was probably stirred up to write his Gospel by the indications of heretical sentiments here manifesting themselves. Here Apollos first preached (Acts xviii. 24-28); and here the third ecumenical council met, which defined the doctrines of the Church over against Nestorius.

Before passing away from the history of Christianity in Ephesus, it is proper to make a more specific mention of the labors of St. Paul in the city. His first visit was on his return from the second missionary tour. He was then accompanied by Priscilla and Aquila. On his second visit he made a sojourn of two or three years (Acts xx. 31), the Athenian king, Codrus. It soon became famous as a mart and hostelry, the harbor affording ample shelter for ships. Asiatic elements mixed on its streets with Greek influences, and colored the social life. The city came successively under the rule of Persians, Macedonians, and the Romans. In 262 A.D. it was destroyed by the Goths. Although rebuilt, it never regained its former glory. The ravages of time and the ruthlessness of man have secured its total desolation. A squallid village, containing only twenty regular inhabitants (Guhl: Ephesiaca, Berlin, 1843; Falkener: Ephesus and the Temple of Diana, Lond., 1862; Wood: Discoveries in Ephesus, London and Boston, 1877 (an interesting and elegant volume); Conybeare and Howson: Life of St. Paul, ii. 80 sqq., Adam ed.; Farrar: St. Paul, ii. pp. 1-14. D. S. Schaff.

EPHESUS, Councils of. The third ecumenical council was held in St. Mary's Church, Ephe-
EPHRAEM.

Ephraem, A.D. 431 (June 22—Aug. 31). It condemned the heresy of Nestorius, that Christ had two persons as well as two natures. It was convened by letters of Theodosius II. and Valentinian II. Cyril of Alexandria presided, and opened the meetings with a hundred and sixty bishops. The number was afterwards increased to a hundred and sixty-eight. Nestorius was cited, but refused to appear until all the bishops had arrived, some of whom, like John of Antioch, were delayed. In the mean time, his heresy was denounced, and himself excluded from the episcopal office, and from all sacerdotal fellowship.

The so-called Robber Council was convened by Theodosius in 449. It was first so denominated by Leo, Bishop of Rome (Epist. 95), on account of the partisan and overbearing demeanor of the presiding officer, and the use of violence in the introduction of soldiery. Dioscurus of Alexandria, a man of hierarchical temper and inordinate ambition, presided. As a hundred and thirty-five bishops were present. The council restored Eutyches, who had been deposed by the synod of Constantinople (448). Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople, was deposed from his office for the hand he had taken in the deposition of Eutyches. All efforts to express dissent were brutally checked. Hilary, Deacon of Rome and papal delegate, one of the dissenters, only narrowly escaped with his life; while Eusebius, Bishop of Dorylaeum, the accuser of Eutyches, lost his through the violence of the soldiery. The decisions of this scandalously conducted council were reversed by the Council of Chalcedon (451). LIT.—MANUS (vols. iv. and vi.) and HÄFEL (vol. ii.); Hist. of the Councils; the Church Histories of NEANDER (vol. iv.) and SCHAFF (vol. ii.), and MILMAN'S Latin Christianity (vol. i.); MARTIN: Actes du Brigandage d'Ephése (trans. from the Syriac), Amiens, 1874; the same: Le Pseudo-Synode connu dans l'histoire sous le nom de Brigandage d'Ephése, étudié d'après ses actes retrouvés en Syriaque, Paris, 1875; Synodum Secundum Ephesinum et codicibus Syracitica MSS. primus editit, S. G. F. PERRY, Oxford, 1878; by the same (Eng. trans.): Acts of the Second Synod of Ephesus, with notes, Dartford, Eng., 1877.

EPHESUS. The Seven Sleepers. This legend gained currency very early, and was adopted in the Koran. Seven Ephesian youths of noble extraction, in the persecutions of Decius (249-257), concealed themselves in a cave which was ordered by the authorities to be sealed up. They fell into a number which lasted for a hundred and eighty-seven years. Some of the stones being removed from the entrance, a ray of light was admitted. Awaking, as from a night's sleep, they sent one of their number (Jamblichus) into the city to buy bread. The obsequiousness of his dress, and the antiquity of the coin which he offered to the baker, no more startled the inhabitants than the change in the aspect of the city confounded himself. The facts becoming known, the bishop and magistrates of the city visited the cavern. After conferring their blessing, the Seven Sleepers immediately expired. See the story well told, Gibbon's 'Rom. and Greg. Hist.' iii. 383 sq.

E'PHRAIM. See Thribs.

EPHREM SYRUS (or Ephraem) is the most prominent of the fathers of the Syrian Church in the fourth century, and the greatest orator and hymn-writer produced by that church.

Life.—Besides the so-called confession of Ephraem (existing both in Greek and in Armenian) and his testament (existing both in Syrian and Greek), we have a panegyric of him by Gregory of Nyssa (written shortly after his death, and found in the fourth century), and a life of him by Gregory of Nyssa (written shortly after his death, and found in the fourth century), by Gregory of Nyssa (written shortly after his death, and found in the fourth century), and an elaborate life of him by Gregory of Nyssa (written shortly after his death, and found in the fourth century), by Gregory of Nyssa (written shortly after his death, and found in the fourth century), and an elaborate life of him by Gregory of Nyssa (written shortly after his death, and found in the fourth century), by Gregory of Nyssa (written shortly after his death, and found in the fourth century), by Gregory of Nyssa (written shortly after his death, and found in the fourth century), by Gregory of Nyssa (written shortly after his death, and found in the fourth century). All these materials are very unreliable, however. They contradict each other, and are full of legendary matter. In modern times his life has been written by Zingerle, in the first part of his translation, and by Alaleben, Berlin, 1853.

Ephraem was born in the beginning of the fourth century, according to a notice in his commentary on Genesis (4: 29), in Mesopotamia; according to Sozomen (Hist. Ecc., III. 16) and the Syrian biography, at Nisibis. He was educated by Bishop Jacob of Nisibis, and seems to have accompanied him to the Council of Nicea (325). When, in 363, the Emperor Julian surrendered Nisibis to the Persians, Ephraem moved first to Amid, the native place of his mother, and then to Edessa, at that time the centre of Syrian learning. He settled among the anchorites in a cave outside the city, adopted a life of severe asceticism, and devoted himself wholly to theological study and authorship. Now and then he appeared among the people; and his hymns and polemical speeches, directed against the Chaldæan astrologers, against Bardeanes and Harmonius, the Arians and Sabellians, Apollinaris, Marcion, etc., made a deep impression, and obtained a lasting influence. Later writers (Assemani, Bibl. Orient., IV. 924) tell us that he founded a school in Edessa; and it is, at all events, certain that he had pupils, and among them some of great celebrity. A tradition reports that he visited Egypt, and stayed there eight years; another, that he visited Basill the Great at Csesarea. He died during the reign of Valens, either 375, or 377, in Edessa, 1877.

Works.—Ephraem was a very prolific author; but of his numerous writings only a part exists in the original Syrian text, and the rest in Greek, Latin, Armenian, and Slavonic translations. A complete list of his writings is given by J. S. Assemani, in Bibl. Orient., I. 98-104, and in the preface to the Roman edition of his Greek works. See also WRIGHT: Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum, 3, 1271. The Slavic translations from his works were edited by J. P. Kohl, Moscow, 1701; the Armenian, by the Mekhitarists, Venice, 1836. The principal edition of the Syriac text is that which appeared in Rome in 6 vols. fol., 1732-46, under papal authority, 3 vols. Greek text, with Latin translation, edited by J. S. Assemani, and 3 vols. Syrian text, with Latin translation, edited by Petrus Benedictus and L. E. Assemani.

It is not yet ascertained whether or not Ephraem himself understood Greek; but it is quite certain that those of his works which have come down to us only in a Greek version are translations. Sozomen says that the works of Ephraem were very
early translated into Greek, even in the lifetime of the author; and this statement is corroborated by the fact that Chrysostom and Jerome were acquainted with them. They consist of sermons, homilies, and tracts, exegetical, dogmatic, and ascetic. In both instances (footnote, p. 196) that he knew fifty-two such productions by Ephraem, and had heard that there existed more than a thousand. In many churches in the East they were read aloud during service, after the Bible readings; and they seem to have attained the same honor in the Western Church. Translations into Latin were early made. Small collections of Ephraem’s discourses translated into Latin circulated in the fifteenth century. The first larger collection (in 3 vols. fol.) was given by Gerhard Vossius, Rome, 1589, and reprinted in 1593 and 1589. It contains 171 pieces, of which only one was translated in full. Of his commentaries on the books of the New Testament, an Armenian translation of that on the Pauline Epistles, and on Tatian’s Diatessaron (for the latter see Zahn: Forschungen zur Gesch. d. N.T. Kanons, Th. I., Erlangen, 1881, pp. 44 sqq., and Lit. below) have come down to us. The rest of his Syrian works, contained in the third volume of the Roman edition, consist of sermons, tracts, and hymns, all written in verse; that is, in lines of an equal number of syllables, grouped together in strophes, and adorned with rhymes and alliterations. The poetical form was, no doubt, adopted as the one best suited to impress the popular mind. At times it becomes prolix and dry; at others it exhibits truly poetical beauty. Several Syrian works ascribed to Ephraem still remain in manuscript; as, for instance, a world’s chronicle from the creation to the birth of Christ, of which one manuscript is found in the library of the Vatican, another in the British Museum.

Of modern translations we mention one in Latin, by CAILLAU (Paris, 1832-35, 8 vols.), forming part of the Paires Selecti, PIUS ZINGERLE: Die heilige Muse der Syrer (Innsbruck, 1830-35), and Augewerbliche Schatul des heiligen Ephraem (Stuttgart, 1870-76); ANGELO PAGO AND FAUSTO LASSINO: Panetti funebri di S. Efrem Sira (Florence, 1851); J. B. MORRIS: thirteen pieces on the Nativity (Oxford, 1847); H. BURGES: Select Hymns and Homilies of Ephraem Syrus (London, 1853); [Evangelii concordantia exposition facta a sancto Ephraemdoctore Syro, in Latinum translatata a R. P. Joanne Baptista Aucher, ed. G. Messinger, Venice, 1879].

C. RÖDGER

EPICTETUS, one of the most imposing representatives of the stoic philosophy, was b. at Hierapolis, in Phrygia, lived afterwards in Rome, first as a slave in the house of Epaphroditus, then as a freedman, and teacher of philosophy, but was in 90 A.D., together with all the other stoical philosophers, expelled from Rome, and settled at Nicopolis, in Epirus, where he continued teaching, and finally died. He wrote nothing himself; but many of his teachings were taken down by his pupils, Flavius Arria (fr. 196) that he knew fifty-two such productions by Ephraem, and had heard that there existed more than a thousand. In many churches in the East they were read aloud during service, after the Bible readings; and they seem to have attained the same honor in the Western Church. Translations into Latin were early made. Small collections of Ephraem’s discourses translated into Latin circulated in the fifteenth century. The first larger collection (in 3 vols. fol.) was given by Gerhard Vossius, Rome, 1589, and reprinted in 1593 and 1589. It contains 171 pieces, of which only one was translated in full. Of his commentaries on the books of the New Testament, an Armenian translation of that on the Pauline Epistles, and on Tatian’s Diatessaron (for the latter see Zahn: Forschungen zur Gesch. d. N.T. Kanons, Th. I., Erlangen, 1881, pp. 44 sqq., and Lit. below) have come down to us. The rest of his Syrian works, contained in the third volume of the Roman edition, consist of sermons, tracts, and hymns, all written in verse; that is, in lines of an equal number of syllables, grouped together in strophes, and adorned with rhymes and alliterations. The poetical form was, no doubt, adopted as the one best suited to impress the popular mind. At times it becomes prolix and dry; at others it exhibits truly poetical beauty. Several Syrian works ascribed to Ephraem still remain in manuscript; as, for instance, a world’s chronicle from the creation to the birth of Christ, of which one manuscript is found in the library of the Vatican, another in the British Museum.

Of modern translations we mention one in Latin, by CAILLAU (Paris, 1832-35, 8 vols.), forming part of the Paires Selecti, PIUS ZINGERLE: Die heilige Muse der Syrer (Innsbruck, 1830-35), and Ausgewerbliche Schatul des heiligen Ephraem (Stuttgart, 1870-76); ANGELO PAGO AND FAUSTO LASSINO: Panetti funebri di S. Efrem Sira (Florence, 1851); J. B. MORRIS: thirteen pieces on the Nativity (Oxford, 1847); H. BURGES: Select Hymns and Homilies of Ephraem Syrus (London, 1853); [Evangelii concordantia exposition facta a sancto Ephraemdoctore Syro, in Latinum translatata a R. P. Joanne Baptista Aucher, ed. G. Messinger, Venice, 1879].

C. RÖDGER

EPIPHANIUS, Bishop of Constantia (the old Salamis of Cyprus), was b. in the beginning of the fourth century, at Besandirke, a village of Palestine, in the vicinity of Eleutheropolis, and educated among monks. He afterwards lived for some time in Egypt, also among monks, and founded, after his return to Palestine, a monastery in his native town, of which he became abbot. His fame for holiness brought him to the metropolitan chair of Constantia (367), and from that time he took an active part in the theological controversies of his age. He was present at a synod in Antioch (378), and at another in Rome (392), where the important questions were debated. He went to Palestine in 394 to crush the influence of the famous Origen, and to Constantinople in 405 for the same purpose. He died on board the ship on which he was returning from Constantinople to Constantia (spring 409).

The life of Epiphanius fell in a period when monasticism — sprung from the martyr-inpiration of the primitive Church, and hailed by the age as a higher standard of virtue — spread rapidly in the East, but at the same time assumed a character of narrow hostility to all free theological investigation, always preferred practical dogmatic definitions to the life of a vigorous personal conviction. But the man’s character
EPISCOPACY.

was well suited to the demands of the time; and he, as well as his friends, considered it a great merit to spend a whole life in bitter opposition to the latest genius the Eastern Church ever produced, without understanding him. He seems, however, to have discovered during his stay in Constantinople,—whether he went at the instance of Theophilus of Alexandria, and for the purpose of opposing Chrysostom, and through him Origen,—that he had in most cases been a tool only in other men's hands. He left the city abruptly and in a rage.

His principal works are, Πανέρισμα ("the drug-chest"), a description and refutation of eighty different heresies, confused and trivial, but of historical value, and Αἰσχρότητα ("the anchor of faith"), a dogmatical work, much read in its time. A life of him by a friend was edited, together with his works, by Petau, Paris, 1822. 2 vols. fol. The best edition of his works is Diendorf's, Leipzig, 1859, 5 vols.: and of the Panarion by Oehler, Berlin, 1858-61, 3 vols. (4 parts). See Gervais: L'Histoire et la Vie de S. Epiphanie, Paris, 1785; Ekerhard: Die Beteiligung des Epiphanius an dem Streite über Origenes, Treves, 1859; Lipsius: Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanius, Vienna, 1865.

EPIPHANIUS, Bishop of Pavia, was b. in that city (439) of noble descent, and educated for the Church. When he was eighteen years old he was ordained a sub-deacon, and in 466 he was unanimously elected bishop by the clergy and the people. After his accession to the episcopal dignity, he increased the severity of his asceticism: he took only one meal a day; he abstained altogether from flesh, from wine, from baths, etc. The same energy he also evinced in taking care of his diocese and the Church in general. He was one of those admirable Italian bishops, who, while the dissolution of the Western Empire was going on, rapidly and inevitably, stood like rocks in the midst of the confusion, breaking the waves. In the wars between Anthemius and Ricimer, he, as vicar of the Church, took the side of the latter, and when peace could not be made, he was part of a certain qualities of the waters, which made them a fit bath of regeneration; and consequently the Epiphany became a favorite term for baptism.

From the East the festival was introduced to the West. The first trace of it in the Western Church is the report, by Ammianus Marcellinus (XXII. 2), that Julian celebrated it at Vienne in 360. But its doctrinal basis was changed. It was referred, not to the manifestation of Christ to man in general, but to his manifestation to the heathens, to the Three Wise Men of the East, to the Holy Kings. It also lost favor as a term for baptism. Pope Leo I. opposed this custom as an "irrational novelty." On the whole, in the Western Church it never became more than an appendix to the Epiphany, hence its familiar English name "Twelfth-Day."

EPISCOPACY. Under Bishop will be found a discussion of the origin, functions, and relative position of the bishop. The design of this article is to give a concise statement of the views held on the subject by different Christian communions.

I. The Roman-Catholic Church holds to the divine origin of Episcopacy. Its position was distinctly defined by the Council of Trent at its twenty-third session: "If any one saith that in the Catholic Church there is not a hierarchy instituted by divine ordinance, consisting of bishops, priests, and deacons, let him be anathema" (Canon vi.). Episcopacy is as essential to the Church as the sacraments. The Church cannot exist without it. The words of Cyprian (iv. Ep. 8), Ecclesia est in Episcopo ("The Church is in the Bishop"), conceivably represent this view. The bishops are the immediate successors of the apostles (Apostolis vicaria ordinatione succedunt, Cyprian, Ep. 60 ad Flor.), and superior to the priests and deacons, not merely in extent of jurisdiction, but in the kind of grace and function. Ordination is a sanctifying grace, and confers a special grace, which is permanent. The Pope, or Bishop, of Rome is at the head of the hierarchy of bishops, and is the immediate successor of St. Peter, upon whom Christ promised to rear his Church (Matt. xvi. 18, 19), and who was the first Bishop of Rome. All bishops are subject to him as the vicar of Christ, and their apostolic power is derived through consecration. The Vatican Decrees (Session iv.) assigned to the Roman pontiff authority over the "Universal Church," and above ecumenical councils. This limits the prerogative of the bishop materially, and is opposed to the view ably advocated by D'Ailly and Gerson in the fifteenth century and by Gallicanism, and adopted by the Old Catholics.

II. The Eastern Church holds likewise to the divine origin of Episcopacy, to the transmission of apostolic succession; and by Gallicanism, and adopted by the Old Catholics.
supreme authority in the Church and over the bishops.

III. The Jansenist Church of Holland, and the Old Catholics, both agree with the Roman-Catholic Church on the question of Episcopacy, but differ from it in their allegiance to the Pope. The episcopate in Holland was received (in 1724) from Dominique Marie Varlet, Bishop of Babylon, then living in Amsterdam. Other Catholic bishops, on being applied to, refused the rite of consecration. Each new consecration ever since has been noticed by a special excommunication from Rome. The Old Catholics secured their orders from the Jansenists of Holland, the Bishop of Deventer consecrating Bishop Reinkens (Aug. 11, 1778), who subsequently consecrated Dr. Herzog, Bishop for Switzerland (Sept. 18, 1876); so that they preserve the apostolic succession.

IV. The Church of England and the Episcopal Church of the United States tolerate two classes of opinion,—the Anglo-Catholic or High Church view, and the Low or Broad Church view. The Anglo-Catholic view of the episcopate is in essential particulars that of the Roman Catholic Church. It does not recognize the superior authority of the Pope, as the vicar of Christ and the infallible successor of St. Peter, nor even the jurisdiction of the Pope, as the vicar of Christ and the infallible successor of St. Peter, nor even the apostolic succession; and its bishopric in America is not the only form of government, but it is the one best adapted to forward the interests of Christ's kingdom among men. The episcopate is not the only form of ordination. But it is the one best adapted to forward the interests of Christ's kingdom among men. The episcopal is not the only form of ordination, but it is the one best adapted to forward the interests of Christ's kingdom among men. The episcopate was formed out of the presbyteral order elevar...
only one of expediency. The Lutheran Church in Sweden has bishops, the validity of whose orders a committee was appointed in 1574 by the convention of the Episcopal Church in the United States, to investigate. The convention has taken no further action. There is much doubt concerning the integrity of the succession. Lawrence Petersen was consecrated by Paul Justin, Bishop of Abo, in 1575. Archbishop of Upsala. The evidence for the validity of Justin's consecration is defective. But the confessions of the Swedish Church recognize the equality of the ministry. The bishops of the Church of Denmark have no claim whatever to apostolic succession, although the English bishops of India have recognized Danish ordination. Christians III. in 1538 imprisoned the old bishops; and the new ones whom he appointed were at first called superintendents, and ordained by Bugenhagen.

The Reformed Churches recognize two orders of the ministry—presbyters and deacons. The bishops of the New Testament are regarded as identical with presbyters. They do not deny that Episcopacy as a matter of expediency is justifiable; but they do not concede either its divine origin, or the transmission of grace by the imposition of hands, or apostolic succession, in the Anglo-Catholic sense. (See Form of Government of Presbyterian Church, chaps. iii., v., etc.)

IX. The American Methodist church has an Episcopacy. It is neither diocesan nor hierarchic, but itinerant and presbyteral. The bishops constitute an "itinerant general superintendency," and are "amenable to the body of ministers and preachers," who may divest them of their office. They are not a distinct order of the clergy, but only presbyters. The Methodist Church cannot lay claim to apostolical succession, if it would.

John Wesley, after having previously applied in vain to Bishop of London to ordain preachers for America, himself ordained the first bishop, Thomas Coke, in 1784. "The Evangelical Association and the Church of the United Brethren also have episcopates. Their bishops are only elected for a stated period, and not for life. For further information see the articles under these special heads.

For literature, see arts. Bishop, Polity, and the Forms of Government and Confessions of the several communions.

EPISCOPAL CHURCH, The Protestant, in the United States of America. History. The first known clerical representative of the Church of England in America was Albert de Prato, a learned mathematician, and a canon of St. Paul's, London, who visited St. John's, Newfoundland, in August, 1527. The next clergyman appeared after the Reformation, in connection with Plymouth's expedition of 1578. This was Woolfall, who landed in the Countess of Warwick's Sound, and celebrated the first English communion recorded in connection with the New World. In 1683 Sir Humphrey Gilbert proclaimed the order of the English Church in Newfoundland. In 1684, Sir Walter Raleigh commenced his unsuccessful attempt to colonize Virginia, where, in 1587, the clergyman attached to the Colony baptized Manteo, an Indian chief. About the same time he also baptized Virginia Dare, the first white Christian born in Virginia. In 1605 the expedition of Waymouth reached the coast of Maine, and explored the Kennebec, having on board a person who regularly performed the service of the Church of England. In 1567 the work of colonization was commenced, both in Virginia and New England. On the coast of Maine the passengers and crews of two ships, sent out by Gilbert, landed at Monhegan, Aug. 9, 1607 (Q. S.). A sermon was preached, and the first New-England Thanksgiving was observed. A colony was commenced at the mouth of the Kennebec, where, until the spring of 1608, the chaplain (the Rev. Richard Seymour) regularly celebrated the service of the Church of England, which was familiar to the savage ear on that coast nearly twenty years before the arrival of "The Mayflower" at Plymouth. This colony attempted on the peninsula of Sabino was not successful, though scattered emigrants continued to pursue the fisheries on the adjacent coasts. In Virginia, however, the work of colonization, under Church-of-England leaders, went on without interruption, the minister being the Rev. Mr. Hunt. When the Leyden adventurers reached New England (in 1620), the Virginia Colony was an accomplished fact. On Christmas Day, 1621, the "most part" of the people at Plymouth desired to keep the festival, showing their attachment to the Church of England. Soon, however, they were outnumbered by fresh arrivals; and the majority of the people who landed elsewhere set up their standard against the church, which it was expected they would favor on reaching their new homes. Soon the scattered adherents of the Church of England found that they were not to be tolerated in Massachusetts; and New Hampshire, under Mason, became the chief resort of the persecuted who sought religious liberty, though the Rev. William Blackstone went to Rhode Island. In 1631 the church services were celebrated in New Hampshire by the Rev. Richard Gibson; and in 1640, at Portsmouth (the ancient "Strawberry Bank"), an Episcopal Church (the present St. John's) was duly organized, being the first English church established on this continent. In 1662 the royal proclamation secured to churchmen in Massachusetts the nominal liberty to observe their own forms of worship, and in 1682 King's Chapel was organized at Boston. After this period, Church-of-England clergymen labored in various parts of New England; and, though bitterly opposed, they met with some success, especially in Connecticut, where, in 1722, Cutler (president of Yale College) and six others declared for episcopacy. During the colonial period the strength of the church advanced in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Georgia, and the Carolinas. Trinity Church, New-York City, was in existence as early as 1693. The Rev. William Veasey, formerly a Presbyterian minister, became the first rector; and the churchmen of New York appear to have acted on the belief that the Ministry Act of 1698 was designed for their exclusive benefit. In due time the church became an acknowledged power. In New Jersey also, under Lord Cornbury, the church practically enjoyed the benefits that attend establishment. In Maryland, Virginia, and Georgia the church was formally established by law; and at one period the Vir-
ginians were almost exclusively Episcopalians. The church continued to grow, especially under the impetus given by the missionaries of the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, organized in 1701; but at the Revolution, a large portion of the clergy being royalists, the congregations, to a great extent, were broken up, and their property dissipated. At the close of the war the church was a melancholy wreck. Nevertheless, the clergy who remained commenced the work of restoration, aiming especially to secure the episcopate, which many had desired to obtain during the colonial period. Before the evacuation of New York by the British, the Rev. Samuel Seabury had been recommended for the office, and was consecrated by the non-juring bishops at Aberdeen, Scotland, Nov. 14, 1784. The first meeting for organization was held at New Brunswick, N.J., in May, 1784. In September, 1785, another convention was held in Philadelphia, when the so-called "Proposed Book" was drawn up, and when the convention also framed and adopted the constitution for the church known as "The Protestant-Episcopal Church." At the convention held in Philadelphia the following June, the members not being satisfied with the consecration of Seabury, the Rev. Samuel Provoost, D.D., the Rev. William White, D.D., and the Rev. David Griffith, D.D., were chosen, and instructed to proceed to England, and obtain consecration. Feb. 4, 1787, Drs. White and Provoost were consecrated in Lambeth Chapel by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. John Moore, Dr. Griffith failing to appear. Subsequently the Rev. James Madison, D.D., was consecrated, the succession being made threefold. At the triennial convention of 1789 the consecration of Bishop Seabury was recognized, thus securing the admission of New England. The convention adjourned to September, when the present Book of Common Prayer was adopted, and the church entered fully upon her independent career, under the leadership of the sagacious Bishop White, who stood the acknowledged head for a period of forty years.

Organization. — This church is organized on the primitive episcopal plan, embracing a system of dioceses; the ministry being composed of the threefold order of bishops, priests, and deacons. The first order comprehends both the diocesan bishops and the missionary bishops, home and foreign. Each diocesan has charge of a particular diocese, while the missionary bishop presides over a jurisdiction formed of one or more States or Territories, or parts thereof. A missionary bishop may be elected bishop of a diocese, but the diocesan cannot; though, in case his diocese is divided, he may decide which part he will retain. Many States form a single diocese, while others are divided into several. The Episcopal Church in the United States has no legal connection with the Church of England, being governed in accordance with a constitution, and a body of canons drawn up and approved by conventions of the bishops, clergy, and laity. The legislative body known as convocation, is composed of the House of Bishops and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies. The approval of both houses is necessary to render any act effective. The House of Bishops (which is the upper house, corresponding to the Senate of the United States) is composed of both the diocesan and missionary bishops; and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies consists of an equal number of clergy and laity. Regularly organized diocesan conventions. This lower house admits delegates from missionary jurisdictions to a seat; and they also have a voice on matters in which they are specially interested, but have no vote. The upper house is presided over by the bishop senior in consecration, who also has charge of various interests affecting the general administration of the church. The presiding officer of the lower house is chosen by ballot. The General Convention meets triennially. The Diocesan meets annually; being composed of three lay delegates from each parish in union with the convention, in addition to the duly qualified parochial clergy. Recently the attempt has been made, with some degree of success, to introduce the provincial system, in accordance with which two or more dioceses may enter into a confederation for the purpose of promoting such particular objects as may not come within the range of either Diocesan or General Conventions. Such confederated dioceses may have a special council and an appellate court. Many dioceses are divided into convocations, whose chief work is to advance missions within their own boundaries. Lay representation forms a special feature of this church, in which respect it is unlike the Church of England.

Discipline. — The discipline of the church is administered in accordance with the canons expressly provided; and all classes of the bishops, clergy, and laity, must be presented and tried by their peers. The church at large has no appellate court; but an appeal may be taken to the General Convention.

Doctrine. — The doctrine of the church, as drawn from Holy Scripture, is incorporated in the Book of Common Prayer, and is expressed chiefly by means of the Apostles' and the Nicene Creed, together with thirty-eight of the Articles of the Church of England, modified to meet the condition of things in this country. In framing the Book of Common Prayer, the American Church, while affirming a general agreement with the Church of England, made certain departures. The Athanasian Creed is omitted. In the Apostles' Creed, the clause "He descended into hell" is made optional, as well as the use of the sign of the cross in baptism; while the Absolution is made declarative, instead of positive, and is left out of the office for the visitation of the sick. In various other respects the American Prayer-Book conforms better to the wants of the average mind. The office for the Holy Communion is generally regarded as more especially the work of Bishop Seabury, showing as it does, quite strongly, the influence of the Scotch Communion office. Yet, while decided in its teaching as respects the presence of Christ in the sacrament, its language is irrevocably opposed to the theory of an objective presence, as it is to consubstantiation; the worshipper being in a different condition, but in a spiritual sense, and in a manner that has baffled all attempts at statement upon the part of the doctors of the Catholic Church. The baptismal office has been cited in support of that
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extreme view of "the washing of regeneration," which has been pushed to the border of the opus operatum; yet the bishops of the church, in 1870, put forth what is known as the "Declaration," affirming that the word "regenerate" is not used in the baptismal office so "as to determine that a mark shall be put in the subject, but rather a mark in the sacrament." The Articles, to which Bishop Seabury was strenuously opposed, as the Scotch Church had none, do not meet with universal approval. In substance they are orthodox, and in spirit thoroughly Protestant; still they are intended to be comprehensive. On Predestination and Free Will they seem to serve the purpose of both Calvinist and Arminian. Indeed, the entire doctrinal system of the Protestant-Episcopal Church is tolerant. The church has continued in the lines of reformation adopted by the Church of England, in opposition to the policy of many Protestants on the Continent; the intention being to embrace all of the laity who accept the Christian faith as contained in the Apostles' Creed, no one being debarred from communion on account of any opinion entertained in connection with the test questions of certain denominations. Accordingly the Episcopal Church embraces various schools of thought, ranging from the so-called Evangelical to the Sacramentarian, or from the Genevan to the advanced Oxford type. Yet the schools in the American Church are not always to be considered as identical with those passing under the same name in England. All phases of theological opinion undergo essential modification in passing from the English to the American Church. This is especially the case with respect to the Broad-Church type of thought, which, in the Protestant-Episcopal Church, often comprehends the liberal Evangelical and the high advocate of church order; being a feeling as well as a conviction, though it also includes the rationalist and the legendarian.

Institutions.—The institutions of the church are quite numerous, and the principal ones only are mentioned. The Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society, founded in 1820, and incorporated in 1846. Its work extends throughout the United States, to Mexico, Africa, China, and Japan. The General Theological Seminary, situated in New-York City, was founded at about the same period as the missionary society, is selected from all the dioceses. The American Church Missionary Society, the Evangelical Education Society, and the Evangelical Knowledge Society are of more recent origin, being devoted to the promotion of so-called evangelical interests. The Society for the Increase of the Ministry has a wider scope. Mention should also be made of the Free Church Association (devoted to the work of increasing the number of free sittings), the Church Congress, the Church Temperance Society, and the American Church Building-Fund Commission, with the Western Church Building Society. The colleges and theological seminaries number about twenty-five; Columbia and Trinity College holding the foremost rank. A Quarterly Review is published, together with twelve or more newspapers, several of which are influential and widely circulated.
quence of this the Church of England has always contained within itself two manners of peoples, two schools or parties,—one asserting its Protestantism, the other claiming its affinity with Rome.

When the Church of England in the Colonies became the Protestant-Episcopal Church of the United States, these influences, which had been transmitted and perpetuated here, secured the retention of the same Formularies and Articles; and so the American Book of Common Prayer wears all the marks of the old compromise.

In the early part of the second quarter of the present century the Tractarian movement began in Oxford. It was an attempt to revive those Anglo-Catholic sentiments which had been largely developed by Archbishop Laud, and, after his time by the non-juring clergy. It counted among its High, protestant the Ritualistic party, affiliated with the High-Church party. Framed by this mania, was besieged with remonstrances, suggestions, and petitions for redress and relief. These pleadings brought no result. The applications were either dishonored, or referred to committees, for quiet burial, to be heard of no more.

The fate of these measures convinced many of the Low-Church party that the dominant majority were resolved to yield nothing, that no reform could be hoped for within the Protestant-Episcopal Church, and they must either crush their consciences, or seek relief elsewhere.

These events were keenly watched by the Christian public generally, and undoubtedly exerted a great influence on the struggle.

They were:

I. The trial (February, 1867) and admonition of the Rev. S. H. Tyng, jun., for preaching in a Methodist Church in New Brunswick, N.J., within the claimed parochial limits of a parish of the Protestant-Episcopal Church.

II. The trial (1868) of Rev. J. F. Hubbard of Rhode Island, for exchanging pulpits with a Baptist clergyman.

III. The sentence of suspension, subsequently of degradation, passed by an ecclesiastical court, in the diocese of Illinois, upon Rev. (now Bishop) Charles E. Cheney, for the omission of the word "regenerate" in the baptismal office.

Meanwhile the General Convention of the Protestant-Episcopal Church, which meets triennially, was besieged with remonstrances, suggestions, and petitions for redress and relief. These applications were either dishonored, or referred to committees, for quiet burial, to be heard of no more.

The fate of these measures convinced many of the Low-Church party that the dominant majority were resolved to yield nothing, that no reform could be hoped for within the Protestant-Episcopal Church, and they must either crush their consciences, or seek relief elsewhere.

These measures widened the chasm. Evangelical men became more and more resolute in the purpose of the Permanent Church, the Ritualistic party, affiliated with the High-Church party to the defence of the same Formularies and Articles; and so the American Book of Common Prayer wears all the marks of the old compromise.

This Romeward drift became shortly afterwards apparent in the Protestant-Episcopal Church in the United States; conspicuously so at the time of the ordination of the Rev. Arthur Carey in New York, July, 1843. This young man deemed the difference between the Protestant-Episcopal Church and the Church of Rome such as embraced no points of faith, doubted whether the Church of Rome or the Anglican Church were the more pure, considered the Reformation from Rome unjustifiable, and declared that he received the Articles of the Creed of Pius IV. so far as they were repetitions of the decrees of the Council of Trent. On the ground of these views the Rev. Drs. Hugh Smith and Henry Anthou proposed the ordination of the Rev. Arthur Carey in the Protestant-Episcopal Church in this country. Newman and a number of others of the more advanced medievalists subsequently united with the Church of Rome. It is estimated that by 1822 two hundred clergyman, and as many more Laymen thus influenced, had abjured Protestantism.

This Romeward drift became shortly afterwards apparent in the Protestant-Episcopal Church in the United States; conspicuously so at the time of the ordination of the Rev. Arthur Carey in New York, July, 1843. This young man deemed the difference between the Protestant-Episcopal Church and the Church of Rome such as embraced no points of faith, doubted whether the Church of Rome or the Anglican Church were the more pure, considered the Reformation from Rome unjustifiable, and declared that he received the Articles of the Creed of Pius IV. so far as they were repetitions of the decrees of the Council of Trent. On the ground of these views the Rev. Drs. Hugh Smith and Henry Anthou proposed the ordination of the Rev. Arthur Carey in the Protestant-Episcopal Church in this country. Newman and a number of others of the more advanced medievalists subsequently united with the Church of Rome. It is estimated that by 1822 two hundred clergyman, and as many more Laymen thus influenced, had abjured Protestantism.

This was an attempt to revive those Anglo-Catholic sentiments which had been largely developed by Archbishop Laud, and, after his time by the non-juring clergy. It counted among its High, protestant the Ritualistic party, affiliated with the High-Church party. Framed by this mania, was besieged with remonstrances, suggestions, and petitions for redress and relief. These pleadings brought no result. The applications were either dishonored, or referred to committees, for quiet burial, to be heard of no more.

The fate of these measures convinced many of the Low-Church party that the dominant majority were resolved to yield nothing, that no reform could be hoped for within the Protestant-Episcopal Church, and they must either crush their consciences, or seek relief elsewhere.

They were anxiously waiting the indications of Providence when the Sixth General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance met in the city of New York (October, 1873). While this distinguished body was in session, a union communion service was held in one of the churches of the city, at which, in company with the representatives of other denominations, Bishop George D. Cummins, D.D., assistant bishop of the Protestant-Episcopal Church in the diocese of Kentucky, by invitation officiated. For this act of Christian courtesy and fellowship he was at once bitterly assailed through the press by representatives of the High-Church party. Pained by this manifestation of exclusiveness, and convinced, by previous experience in the diocese of Kentucky, that his official position obliged him to countenance, in some degree, the growing evils of ritualism, Bishop Cummins reached the conclusion that he could not, without sin, longer give his life, ministry, and influence to the advancement of a church which, as interpreted by the great majority of its adherents, denied the brotherhood of believers in Christ.
This church recognizes but two orders in the ministry,—the presbyterate and the diaconate. The episcopate is not an order, but a title given to the bishop being simply the first presbyter. The bishops preside over synods or jurisdictions, do not, as in the Protestant-Episcopal Church, constitute a separate house, but in council vote with and as their brother-presbyters, and are subject to confirmation appointments by the General Council. See Journals Ten General Councils R. E. C.; Memoir Bishop Cummins, N.Y., 1878; B. ATCRIGE: Memoirs R. E. C., N.Y., 1875, new ed., 1882.

W. T. Sabine
(Pastor First Ref. Epis. Church, New York).

EPISCOPUS, Simon, b. in Amsterdam, 1583; d. there 1943; studied, at Leyden, philosophy and theology, under Jacob Arminius and Franciscus Gomarus; but, when the great controversy between the Arminians and the Gomorists broke out, he declared for the former, and suffered (especially after the death of Arminius, 1609) so much from the intolerance of the latter, that he left Leyden altogether, and settled at Franeker. In 1610 he accepted the position as minister of Blyeswijk, a village in the neighborhood of Rotterdam; and when, in 1611, Gomarus retired from his chair in Leyden, Episcopius was appointed his successor. In the beginning he experienced no troubles. He wrote his commentaries upon the Revelation and the First Epistle of John, his paraphrase of the twenty-four first chapters of Matthew, etc.; but by degrees, as his fame grew and the importance of the Arminian party increased, the annoyances from the side of the Gomorists began. At the synod of Dort (1618) he was the principal spokesman of the Arminians, but produced very little effect. He and twelve other Arminian theologians were condemned by the synod, and banished from the country. Episcopius went to the Spanish Netherlands, and settled in Brussels, where he wrote his Confessio (1622), in the name of all Arminian theologians, and his Responsio ad duas Petri Waddingii Jesuicte epistolae, etc. On the outbreak of the war between France and Spain he returned to France, where he lived, partly in Paris and partly in Rouen, and wrote a great number of his minor treatises. In 1626 he was allowed to return to his native country, and was appointed at the Remonstrant Church in Amsterdam, and in 1634 professor of theology in the Arminian college in that city. To this last period of his life belong, besides his Apologia pro Confessione and Versus Theologum Remonstrantis, his two principal works, Institutiones Theologicae and Responsio ad Quæstiones Theologicas, which became the standard works of Arminian theology. A collected edition of his works appeared in two volumes folio, the first volume edited by Carcella, 1650, the second by Polenbrugh, 1665. His life was written by Philip Limborch in Dutch, and afterwards translated into Latin, 1700. See Calder: Memoirs of Simon Episcopius, New York, 1837.]

HEPEPE

EPISCOPUS IN PARTIBUS, episcopus titulus, episcopus suffraganeus. When the Arabs conquered the southern part of Spain, the Christian bishops were expelled, and fled to Orixa. They there remained for centuries, waiting for a return to their dioceses; and when one of them
died, a successor was immediately appointed to him. Something similar took place when the Eastern Church was broken up by the Mohammedans. Dioceses entirely in the hands of the infidels (in peribus infidelium) had bishops, who lived in Rome, or elsewhere, as it became customary to employ these bishops without dioceses as help to such bishops as were unable to manage the whole business of their diocese. Many misuses and corruptions grew up from this custom; and the councils, from that of Ravens (1311) to that of Trent (1545), tried hard to regulate, without destroying altogether, the useful practice.

**EPISTLES.** The letters of the apostles contained in the New Testament are called, may be divided into *congregational*, those addressed to a particular church and dealing with doctrinal or practical questions; *private*, those addressed to individuals, yet containing matter of wider interest; and *general*, those of an encyclical character, not meant for any one church or persons such as the Apostle Paul belong to the first two classes, or even to all three. If the words, “to Ephesus,” be left out of Eph. i. 1, as there is weighty authority for doing; in which case this Epistle would be general. John’s Epistles belong to the last two classes; James’s, Peter’s, and Jude’s to the last. There are thirteen Epistles of Paul, three of John, two of Peter, and one each of James and Jude. The Epistle to the Hebrews is of uncertain authorship.

The Epistles in their outward form are similar to those of their day. With the exception of Hebrews and 1 John, they begin, according to the custom, with the author’s name, and that of the person or congregation primarily addressed. Then follows the salutation (omitted in 3 John). This is usually “grace” and “peace;” but in 1 and 2 Timothy, 2 John, and Jude, “mercy” is added; while James employs the classic Greek expression, “greeting.” “Grace” was Greek and “peace” Hebrew; but they were not used by these writers in their original sense, which referred rather to physical health and temporal comfort, but transformed into a prayer for the saving grace of God and the peace in Christ. In the body of the Epistle the first personal pronouns, singular and plural, are used indiscriminately, just as they are in Cicero’s letters. The terminations of the Epistles vary. James closes abruptly, and so does 1 John; 2 and 3 John close with salutations; Romans and Jude, with a doxology; the remaining Epistles, with a brief benediction.

The earlier Epistles antedate the Gospels. There was need of direction prior to written accounts of the life of Jesus. Our collection by no means includes all the letters of the apostles, but only such as were inspired for the reading and guidance of the Church in all ages.

Paul employed an amanuensis (Rom. xvi. 22), and only added a few words at the close in his own hand, by way of authentication; for it would seem that his letters had been forged or plagiarized (1 Pet. iv. 16; ii. 20; 2 Thess. iii. 17, cf. ii. 2). This fact explains many of the peculiarities of the style of the great apostle; for his sentences often read like the utterances of an impassioned speaker.

His letters were the answers of his heart and head to questions submitted to him. He put all his learning, his dialectical skill, his tact and judgment, and also all his affection, at the service of his converts and friends. His fellow-writers did the same, according to their ability.

In the Epistles are many doctrinal statements, upon which different theologies are founded, besides rich practical instruction. The chief facts of the gospel are alluded to; and so, if the Gospels were destroyed, the Church would yet possess an inspired though fragmentary history of her Lord. One of the most important services of the Epistles is their stimulus and support to the piety of the Church. Many passages in Paul’s writings, 1 and 2 Peter, and 1 John entire, have ever been of incalculable value in centering the thought of the Church upon Christ. The common sense of James makes it the “business man’s epistle;” but even this is full of the spirit of the Master. No other religion can boast of such letters as the twenty-one Epistles of the New Testament. Their existence is an unanswerable argument for the divine origin of Christianity. See Letters, Paul, Writing; also art. Epistle in the Bible Dictionaries.

**EPISTOLAE OBSCURORUM VIRORUM.** The first edition of this famous book appeared in 1515, containing forty-one letters. A second edition, unchanged, soon followed, and a year later a third, augmented with seven letters. In 1517 a new series appeared, numbering sixty-two letters, which in the second edition were augmented with eight. Full information with respect to the history of the work may be found in Eduard Bücking: *Ulrichi Huiteni operum supplementum*, Leipzig, 1884-70, 2 vols., containing also the various answers to the book.

The immediate occasion for the production of the *Epistole obscurorum virorum* was the publication in 1514, at Tübingen, of the *Epistole clarorum virorum*. The latter intended to place the mental wealth of the humanists in a proper light; and, as a supplement, the former undertook to give a picture of the mental poverty and moral obscurantism of the Roman Catholic Church, its monks, and its scholasticism. In its details the book is often coarse, and somewhat offensive to modern taste; but, considered as a whole, it is nevertheless a brilliant performance. The caricature of
the style and language then used in the monasteries is extremely ludicrous; and the saeculic with which the civi obscures lay bare their own ignorance and stupidity is very enjoyable.

With respect to the authorship, the plan of this "mimical satire" was due to Crotus Rubianus; and Ulrich von Hutten, a learned and fearless knight (see art.), was his principal collaborator. The effect was tremendous. In some places the monks mistook the book, and believed it to be a serious performance in their favor; but the mistake was of course soon discovered, and the delight turned into rage. Ortwin Gratius, to whom the letters are addressed, a comical person, a scholastic in humanist robe, the poetislaasinus, as Luther called him, did his utmost to suppress it by means of a papal brief, and to disturb its influence by writing against it. [German trans., by Dr. Wilhelm Binder, Briefe von Dunkelmännern, Stuttgart, 1876.]

BERNARD RIGGENBACH.

EQUITIUS, abbot of several monasteries in the province of Valeria (a district in Abruzzo Ulteriore, thus called because it was traversed by the Via Valeria), flourished in the sixth century, and is there an account of him, much mixed up with genealogical matters, is found in Gaeonon 1. : Dial., I. 4.

The era (Latin era, or era) occurs for the first time in Isidorus' Etym. (V. 30), and is there applied to a chronological arrangement by Augustus, beginning with the year 716 A.U.C. Afterwards it became the common name for any chronological arrangement starting from a fixed point. Its etymology is uncertain. Ideler derives it from the Gothic jara ("year"), and asserts that it was first used for the chronology which the Visigoths founded established in Spain and Southern France. Others derive it (and with more right) from the Latin colere, to tend, and era from os. The term era (singular feminine) is used already by Cicero to denote the unit of certain measurements.

In the books of the Old and New Testaments, traces of an era, properly speaking, occur only in a few passages; a circumstance not to be wondered at, on account of the great age and devotional character of these books. The nations of antiquity used no era, either in their private or in their public life: contrivances of that kind were left solely to the historians and the chronologists by profession. Even the Romans, though they had a fixed era, the Leges colonorum urbis Romae, which, though not often, great national events are used as chronological starting-points; as, for instance, the evocus (Exod. xix. 1; Num. xxxiii. 38; 1 Kings vi. 1), or the beginning of the Babylonian exile (Ezek. xxxiii. 21, xi. 1). When the Jews became Syrian subjects, they adopted the Seleucidian era, beginning with the year 312 B.C. It is uniformly used in the first two books of the Maccabees; though else it appears that the authors of the books of the Maccabees do not date from exactly the same starting-point.

The establishment of the Christian Church was not immediately followed by the establishment of the Christian era. For centuries the Christians continued to date, each in the way to which he was accustomed. Thus the Christians of the East continued to use the Seleucidian era; and, indeed, the Syrian Christians still use it in all ecclesiastical affairs besides the Christian era, only that a difference with respect to the computation of New Year has crept in among them; the Nestorians and Jacobites reckoning from Oct. 1, and the Roman Catholics from Sept. 1. In Alexandria the era of Diocletian was adopted for the computation of Easter. It begins with the reign of Diocletian (Aug. 29, 284); and, as this reign was ushered in with horrible persecutions, the era received the name of Era Martyrum. It was commonly used in Egypt, in all civil affairs, down to the invasion of the Arabs; and it is still used by the Egyptian and Ethiopian Christians, though the latter also employ a world-era, beginning from the creation. The Christian Armenians date from the year 551 A.D., while the Christians, beginning from the year 537 the Emperor Justinian ordered that all public documents should be dated by the year of the emperor, the name of the consul, the indication (tax-period), the month, and the day (Novella, XLVII.; but in 541 the last consul was elected, and the need of a new starting-point for the computation of years became more and more urgent. Meanwhile, in 535, the Roman abbot, Dionysius, had begun in his Easter-tables to count the years of the Incarnation Domini, and not after the era of Diocletian; which, though adopted by the Alexandrians, Old Testament, dates from the year 716 A.U.C.; and generally adopted, became more and more urgent. The first year of this Dionysian era runs from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 754 A.U.C.; and the birth of Jesus falls towards the close of the year. — Dec. 25, as, according to common patristical usage,
incarnatio means conceptio, and not nativitas. This method of computing time found great favor; and Bede and Charlemagne contributed much to introduce it. In the tenth century it was widely adopted. In Spain, however, it did not supersede the so-called Spanish era, beginning with the year 716 B.C., until the latter part of the fourteenth century. In Russia it was introduced in 1700 by Peter the Great. Great inconveniences arose at first, from the circumstance that in different places, the year was begun at different dates. — Dec. 25, Jan. 1, March 25, or Easter Day. Thus there was a difference of a whole year between the chronology of Pisa and that of Florence; and uniformity was not established until 1749. The German emperor began the year at Dec. 25, until the latter part of the sixteenth century; France, at Easter Day, until 1567. Jan. 1 was not fixed upon as New-Year's Day in Scotland until 1599, and in England 1752.

A world's era, dating from the creation, and constructed out of the Old Testament, was in use among the Jews at the time of Christ. The Jew-like, or Jewish era, begins with the birth of Messiah in Nisan, and is calculated by them on the calendar. Such an era seems to recommend itself in several respects; but its construction presents difficulties which can hardly ever be overcome. Every scholar who tries comes to a different result. L'art de vérifier les dates gives no less than a hundred and eight different views; and the two extremes differ no less than two thousand years from each other. Julius Africanus, from the creation to Christ, 5,500 years; Eusebius, Bede, and the Roman martyrology, 5,198; Scaliger and Calvisius, 3,950; Kepler and Petavius, 3,984; Ussher, 4,004, etc.

Uniformity is not to be hoped for under such circumstances; and without uniformity no practical good can be accomplished. The so-called Byzantine or Constantinopolitan era also begins from creation, and counts 5,500 years down to Christ. It first occurs in the Chronicon Paschale, from the seventh century; but it was afterwards generally adopted by the Byzantine historians, the East-Roman emperors, and the patriarchs of the Eastern Church, and it is still used throughout the Greek Church, with the exception of Russia.

ERASMUS, Desiderius, the most brilliant representative of humanistic culture at the beginning of the sixteenth century, and the head of a movement in the interest of a reformation of ecclesiastical abuses which prepared the way for the Protestant Reformation. His life divides itself naturally into three periods; the first, lasting till 1507, was the period of gradual emancipation from the fetters of his age; the second lasted till 1510, and marked his greatest reputation and most efficient reformatory activity; the last is the period of conflict, isolation, and final abandonment of the Reformation movement.

Erasmus was b. in Rotterdam, and d. in Basel July 12, 1536. The date of birth is variously put in 1466, 1467, and 1469. Oct. 28, 1465, is probably the right one, and is favored by the statement of Rhenanus, that Erasmus died in his seventy-eighth year, as by his own statement (Ep. 807, Feb. 26, 1515), "I am eighty years old this year." He seems to have been born out of wedlock. His father, Gerhard Roger, according to some accounts, was a priest at the time; but according to others he did not enter a convent till after the event. Erasmus was sent to the famous school of Hegius at Deventer, attended at that time by two thousand scholars. His parents died in his thirteenth year, and, being cheated by a guardian out of his inheritance, he entered the convent school of Herzogenbusch, and subsequently took vows in the convent of Emaus, at Steyn. At a later period (1514) he calls this step the direct misfortune of his life. In 1491 he went into the service of the Bishop of Cambrai, who sent him to Paris to conclude his studies. While attending the College of Montaigu he contracted a disease, which forced him to seek relief in Holland. Returning to Paris, he acted as tutor to several English youths, one of whom, Lord Mountjoy, induced him to visit England in 1498. Erasmus resided for a while at Oxford, and formed a close friendship with More and Colet. In the face of Henry VII.'s offer of a house, and a pension amounting to a thousand pounds in present money, he returned to the Continent. In 1500 his Adagia (a collection of proverbs and witty sayings derived from ancient writers) appeared, and in 1502 the Enchiridion Militis Christiani, which, he says, was "designed to counteract the error of those who place piety in ceremonies and external observances, but neglect its very essence" (Ep. 102). In 1505 he edited Valla's Annotations to the New Testament with a preface, which calls for a return to the Greek text, and its grammatical exposition as the fundamental conditions of a right understanding of the Scriptures. In 1506 he visited Italy, taking the degree of doctor of divinity at Turin, and receiving from the highest dignitaries marks of distinction. In 1506 he returned to England, forming on the way the plan of his Encomium Moriae ("The Praise of Folly"), which subsequently appeared with a dedication to More in 1511. Here the second period of his career begins.

Erasmus was now in the zenith of his fame, a
fame which has never been surpassed in the annals of men of letters. He remained in England for some years, and in the meantime lecturing at Cambridge. Returning to Brabant, he was elected by the archduke one of his counsellors, and subsequently to a similar position by Charles V. From 1515 to 1521 he resided in Brussels, Antwerp, and Louvain (Ep. 354). A papal brief gave him a much desired relief from the duties and dress of his monastic vow. From 1514 all his writings were published by Froben at Basel. This necessitated frequent journeys to Switzerland through Germany. These journeys were triumphant processions; scholars, councils, and bishops doing him homage. His correspondence at this period was enormous, and included princes, the highest prelates, and the Pope himself. In Germany a party grew up called the "Erasmians," which regarded him as a leader of a new movement in the church as well as in the department of letters. Among the writings of this period are a school-book, de Duplici Copia Verorum ac Returum, 1512, and the Colloquia Familia, 1518, 1522, much enlarged in 1526. The latter is the most read of all Erasmus' writings. It contains the keenest sarcasm, and wittiest salutes against conventual life, fasting, pilgrimages, and the worship of saints. With the Reformers, the most valuable of which is that of Jerome. The most important of all Erasmus' works appeared in 1516. It had a decided influence upon the Reformation. It was an edition of the Greek Testament under the title of Novum Instrumentum omne, diligenter ab Erasmo Roterdamo recognitum et emendatum, etc. Besides the text, it contained a Latin translation, which departed quite largely from the Vulgate; and annotations justifying these departures, explaining different passages, and condemning frequently, by comparison with apostolic teaching, the excesses and ignorance of the monks. The work was prefixed with a dedication to Leo X. to stamp it with the sanction of the Church. An Introduction, composed of three parts, exhorts to the study of Scripture, and the Zurich Polyglot, which, although completed two years previously, did not appear till 1520. The printer's errors were corrected in subsequent editions, but the editorial faults remained. This text had a very large circulation. Within a few decades, thirty unauthorized reprints were made. Erasmus himself sent out four more editions. Luther's translation was based upon the second edition (1519); and in the third (1522) the editor restored to the text 1 John v. 7, "ne cui foret ansa calumniandi." (See Butt. 325). In 1517 he began to publish the Paraphrases of the Epistles and Gospels, which also exerted an extensive influence upon the Reformation.

In these writings Erasmus is in many points the precursor of the Reformation. His satire against ecclesiastical abuses and corruption of the day is keen and bold. He also made the Scriptures the standard of doctrine and life in the Church. They had disabused his own mind of prejudices in favor of the specific holiness of cloistered and celibate life. With the Reformers he thus far agreed. He differed in particulars equally important. They found the essence of Christian doctrine in the reconciliation of the sinner to God and the time of the soul's deliverance from the tyranny of the flesh. Erasmus regarded Christ from another standpoint, as the exemplar of all virtue, and the restorer of moral order to the world. The Reformers were Augustinian in their theology, he Pelagian. Erasmus treated with somewhat of indifference the doctrinal part of Christianity, and at times estimated the morality of Greece and Rome so high as to obliterate the line between it and that of Christianity (Enckir., i., etc.).

There were certain defects of character, and certain qualities of disposition, which explain the failure of Erasmus to understand and advocate the Reformation. His opposition to the state of the Church had proceeded from aesthetic feeling, rather than from moral indignation. Erasmus regarded Christ from another standpoint, as the exemplar of all virtue, and the restorer of moral order to the world. The Reformers were Augustinian in their theology, he Pelagian. Erasmus treated with somewhat of indifference the doctrinal part of Christianity, and at times estimated the morality of Greece and Rome so high as to obliterate the line between it and that of Christianity (Enckir., i., etc.).

The third period of Erasmus' life is marked by a complete rupture with the Reformers. The first prominent of these attributed their emancipation from the dominion of the Church to his writings. Erasmus regarded Christ from another standpoint, as the exemplar of all virtue, and the restorer of moral order to the world. The Reformers were Augustinian in their theology, he Pelagian. Erasmus treated with somewhat of indifference the doctrinal part of Christianity, and at times estimated the morality of Greece and Rome so high as to obliterate the line between it and that of Christianity (Enckir., i., etc.).

[Mr. Froude keenly discriminates between these two men in his essay: "In Luther, belief in God was the first principle of life; in Erasmus it was an inference which might be taken away, and yet leave the world a very tolerable and inhabitable place," etc.] In spite of this, his enemies (Ep. 562) said Luther had sucked poison at his breast, or that he "laid the egg which Luther hatched out." Erasmus was, however, still opposed to persecution, and did not conceal his disgust at the papal bull of excommunication. But in a letter to Leo X., dated Sept. 13, 1520, he hastens to clear himself of all connection with the excommunicated reformer, and to declare that only his incapacity, and fear of stirring up strife, keep him from answering Luther (Ep. 599). Neither death nor life would induce him to leave the communion of the Church (Ep. 621, 645).

In 1521, no longer feeling himself safe in the Netherlands, Erasmus went to Basel to reside permanently. The exaction of tithes and the spiritual abuses and open brazenness of the times occasioned the work which was to follow. On September 12, 1524, he wrote, in answer to the reformer, his Diatribe de Libero Arbitrio. The work shows him to be unequal to the problem, and inferior to Luther, who replied in the De Servo Arbitrio. Erasmus wrote, in 1528, a feeble retort, Hyperaspistes. Luther hence--
forth regarded Erasmus as a "sceptic and epicurean, an enemy of all true religion." In 1523 Erasmus broke with Zwingli; and henceforth he regarded the Reformation as a calamity and a crime (Ep. 906).

In the last decade of his life the most of his editions of the fathers appeared.—Hillery (1529), Ireneus (1529), Ambrose (1527), Augustine (1529), Epiphanius (1529), Chrysostom (1530), Origen (1531). His Modus Confiendi (1525) vindicated the confessional, and his Ecclesiastes (1533) is in many respects a valuable homiletic commentary. While bowing submissively to the Church, he still continued to ridicule ecclesiastical abuses. The Sorbonne, in 1527, condemned thirty-two articles extracted from his works, after having previously forbidden the circulation of the Colloquies in France. But the Pope's friendship suffered no abatement. Paul III. offered to make him cardinal, but he declined on account of age. Erasmus returned to Basel in 1533, where he died of an attack of his old trouble, the stone, combined with dysentery. He died without the priest, but invoking the mercy of Christ. His body lies interred in the cathedral of Basel. A life-like portrait by Hans Holbein hangs in the museum of the same city.


ERASTIANISM. See Erastus.

ERASTUS, Thomas, b. Sept. 7, 1524, at Baden, in Swabia. His parents were both protestant clergy at Auggen, in the margraviate of Baden; d. at Basel, Jan. 1, 1583, studied theology at Basel, and philosophy and medicine at Bologna and Padua, and was in 1558 appointed body-physician to the elector-palatine, and professor of medicine at Heidelberg, 1560, and also moved as professor of medicine, to Basel. As a practical physician he enjoyed a great reputation, and as a student of nature he strenuously opposed the astrology, alchemy, and magic of Paracelsus and his school; but it is chiefly as a theologian that his name has become known to the after-world. He was a pupil of Zwingli; took active part in the conferences at Heidelberg (1560) and Maulbronn (1564); and defended, in the controversy concerning the Lord's Supper, the Swiss view against Dr. Johann Marbach, a Lutheran minister at Strasbourg; and latterly he had occasion to defend his master's ideas against the Calvinists in a question of church-polity. There was in Heidelberg a Calvinist party, headed by Caspar Olevianus, which wanted to introduce in the country a purely presbyterian church-constitution with a corresponding church-discipline. Erastus strongly opposed the movement, but in vain. He was himself the very first victim of the established church-discipline, being excommunicated on a charge of latent Unitarianism. He was restored after five years; but, six years after his death (1589), Castelvetro, who had married his widow, published a work of his, Expositio gratissimae questionis, utrum excommunication mandato nitatur divino, an excogiat sui ab homini, written in 1568, and found among his posthumous papers. The book, written, according to the fashion of the time, in form of theses, and denying that excommunication is a divine ordinance, that the Church has any power to make laws or decrees, and to inflict pains and penalties of any kind, that the sins of professing Christians are to be punished by pastors and elders, instead of the civil magistrate, etc., attracted much attention, and was attacked by Beza. It was translated into English in 1659, and again in 1844, by R. Lee; and its views were adopted by a distinct party in the Westminster Assembly, headed by Selden, Lightfoot, Coleman, and White- locke. Since that time the doctrine of the State supremacy in ecclesiastical causes generally goes under the name of Erastianism; though in its broad sense, and wide application, this doctrine is by no means due to Erastus. G. V. LECHLER.

EREMITE. See Anchorites.

ERNESTI, Johann August, b. Aug. 4, 1707, at Tennstadt, in Thuringia; d. at Leipzig, Sept. 11, 1781; studied at Wittenberg and Leipzig, and was appointed professor, in the latter place, of classical literature (1749), of rhetoric (1759), and of theology (1768). As a philologist he enjoyed a great fame. His editions of Cicero, Homer, Xenophon, Tacitus, etc., were celebrated; and his Opuscula Oratoria (1782), Opuscula philologico-critic (1784), and Initia Doctrinae Solidioris (1780) were much read. His principal theological work is his Institutio Interpretis N. T. (1761), [translated into English by Terrot, and published in the Biblical Cabinet, Edinburgh, 1834,] which opened a new epoch in the history of hermeneutics, and founded the grammatico-historical school. Its principle is, that in a truly inspired book, the sense shall not be sought for, nor can it be found out, by any other method than that applied to an ordinary human book; and by this principle the chains of the old dogmatical method of interpretation were burst. He also edited the Thes. 1760, 2d, 1770-79, second, 1773-79. See TELLER: Ernesti Verdienste um Theologie und Religion, Leipzig, 1783; SEMLER: Zusätze zu Teller, Halle, 1785;
ERSKINE, John, D.D., a distinguished minister of the Church of Scotland; b. at Edinburgh in (or about) 1721; d. there Jan. 19, 1803. He was the eldest son of John Erskine, Esq., of Carnock, a member of the Scottish bar, and the author of The Institutes of the Law of Scotland. His mother was a daughter of the Hon. James Melville of Bagarvie, and grand-daughter of the fourth Lord Melville. It had been intended by his parents that he should follow his father's profession; and for a year or two, out of deference to their wishes, he applied himself to the study of the law. But a strong predilection for the service of the Church had been early formed, and showed itself, even while he was still a law-student, in the publication of a theological work which gained him the friendship of Bishop Warburton. He became a licentiate of the Church in 1743; and in 1744 he was ordained minister of the parish of Kirkintilloch, near Glasgow. In this laborious country-charge duties which throughout his life he always rendered his sermons, which are vigorous
expositions of Calvinism, if not eloquent, interesting and useful. It was at this period of his life, too, that he began a practice which illustrates an important phase of his character; namely, that of maintaining friendly intercourse on religious questions with the representatives of foreign churches. In an age of bigotry and intolerance—at least among the members of the party to which he himself belonged—Dr. Erskine was, if no Broad-Churchman in the modern acceptation of the term, a man of wide sympathies and enlightened Christian liberality. In the list of his earliest correspondents were several distinguished ministers of America, amongst them being found the honored name of Jonathan Edwards. A frequent interchange of letters between Dr. Erskine and leading American ministers was indeed continued down to his death. Reference has already been made to his friendly relations with Bishop Warburton, many of whose letters will be found in Moncreiff's Life. He had no less loyal intercourse with some of the English Dissenters, especially with Mr. George Whitefield and the Woscleys. His correspondence with members of the Continental churches was carried on for a long time under circumstances of peculiar difficulty, from his ignorance of any foreign language except French; and it is a singular proof at once of his energy, and of the importance he attached to fellowship with Christian brethren outside his own church, that, for the purpose of carrying it out more extensively, Dr. Erskine undertook, as late as in his sixtieth year, the acquisition of the Dutch and German languages, and, in the absence of any teacher of these languages within his reach, gained a competent knowledge of them without assistance except from books.

It is greatly to Dr. Erskine's honor that he was one of the first advocates of missions to the heathen in the Church of Scotland, having actively supported and strenuously defended them at a time when, as a rule, churchmen and dissenters were, in Scotland at least, equally indifferent to what is now recognized as one of the chief obligations of the Christian Church. He was married in the year 1746; his wife being Christian Mackay, a daughter of George, Lord Reay. In 1758 he was translated from Kirkintilloch to the parish of Culross, and thence he removed, in 1758, to New Greyfriar's Church, Edinburgh; which charge he held for nine years, afterwards exchanging it for the Collegiate Church of Old Greyfriars in the same city. Here he had Principal Robertson, the historian of Charles V., as his colleague, and, in spite of their differences in ecclesiastical politics, as one of his best friends. In Edinburgh he found his work as a minister somewhat different in character from that of either of his country parishes, but not less laborious; and he was equally conscientious in giving his attention to it, while in the finding time for literary study, and for social intercourse with his friends. As an Edinburgh minister, he was also called to take a more prominent place in public business than before. As a leader in the church courts, he represented for many years the evangelical party in the Kirk, with more effect than any of his colleagues. In this position, as in every other, he was far from adopting extreme views; and it may be added that he enjoyed the respect and esteem of all parties throughout the whole of his long and useful life.

Lit.—A striking description of Dr. Erskine's appearance and manner in the pulpit, and his character as a preacher, evidently derived from personal observation, is given by Sir Walter Scott, in Guy Mannering (see chap. XXXVII.). Two graphic pen-and-ink sketches of him, with biographical notices, will be found in Kay's Series of Original Portraits, Edinburgh, 1837, vol. I. pp. 171-176. See, however, especially, the Account of the Life and Writings of John Erskine, D.D., by Sir Henry Moncreiff Wellwood, D.D., Edinburgh, 1818. WILLIAM LEE.

ERSKINE, Ralph, M.A., minister of Dunfermline, N.B.; b. at Monilaws, on the English border, March 15, 1685; d. at Dunfermline, Nov. 6, 1752. He was a brother of Ebenezer Erskine (see above), with whose ecclesiastical views he sympathized, and whose secession from the Church he eventually joined. His diary shows him to have been a man of fervent piety. He was hardly less popular as a preacher than his brother; and his Gospel Sonnets and other Scripture Songs were received with favor in his own day. His works were published after his death, in two vols. folio, Glasgow, 1784. See Donald Fraser: Life and Diary of Ralph Erskine, Edinburgh, 1824. WILLIAM LEE.

ERSKINE, Thomas, of Linlathen, b. in Edinburgh, Oct. 13, 1788; d. there March 20, 1870. He was educated a lawyer, and practised from 1810 to 1816; but then, succeeding to the family estate at Linlathen, near Dundee, he retired from the bar, and spent the rest of his life in the care of his property, and in literary labor in behalf of his views. He never married. While still a young man, he rebelled at the current Scotch theology, and at length found what he conceived was a better way in which to represent the divine revelation. His views may be thus expressed: the only proper criterion of the truth of Christianity is "its conformity or nonconformity with man's spiritual nature, and its adaptability or nonadaptability to man's universal and deepest spiritual needs." The incarnation of Christ was "the necessary manifestation to man of an eternal righteousness, possessed of an immortal power. This faith could be properly awakened only by the manifestation, through Christ, of love as the law of life, and as identical with an eternal righteousness which it was God's purpose to bestow on every individual soul" (Encyc. Brit., 9th ed., vol. viii. pp. 550, 551). Such views were not "orthodox," and at first subjected Mr. Erskine to considerable adverse criticism. But they gained favor; and he numbered among his intimate friends some of the finest minds of the century.—Thomas Carlyle, Edward Irving, Frederick Denison Maurice, John McLeod Campbell, Bishop Ewing, and Dean Stanley. Maurice and Campbell were indebted to him for those conceptions of the atonement which have had so great an effect upon later
ESCHATOLOGY.
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ESCHATOLOGY, or "the doctrine of the last things," is that branch of theology which concerns itself with the termination of our earthly life, and those things which may lie beyond death. The term may have been derived, like the old designation, De Novissimis, from Jesus Sirach (vii. 30). The expression τὰ τελευταῖα, or "the last things," is of biblical origin (comp. Isa. ii. 2; Mic. iv. 1). This sketch cannot go into a discussion of the particular subjects of eschatology. They will be found treated under their special headings.

The meaning of death, and the question of a future life, have engaged thought at all times; and hardly a people has been found destitute of all belief in a future existence.

The position of the Old Testament on this question has been a matter of dispute. Expositors, from the older Jews and the church fathers down to the present day, have differed as to whether it teaches immortality or not. Israel, in the first instance, turned its hopes not to the destiny of the individual, but to the coming of the Messiah, and the regeneration living at the time of that coming (Ios. vi. 2; Isa. xxxv. 8; Ezek. xxxvii.). Only as a secondary matter is the presentiment introduced of the restoration of the righteous dead, who should participate in the glory of Israel (Isa. xxxv. 19; Dan. xii. 2, 3). In the New Testament this view is again introduced, and the dying are represented as the "firstfruits" of the dead, and its language is with regard to the descent into Hades, punishment, purgatory, etc., the meaning of death, and the question of a future life, have engaged thought at all times; and hardly a people has been found destitute of all belief in a future existence.

The position of the Old Testament on this question has been a matter of dispute. Expositors, from the older Jews and the church fathers down to the present day, have differed as to whether it teaches immortality or not. Israel, in the first instance, turned its hopes not to the destiny of the individual, but to the coming of the Messiah, and the regeneration living at the time of that coming (Ios. vi. 2; Isa. xxxv. 8; Ezek. xxxvii.). Only as a secondary matter is the presentiment introduced of the restoration of the righteous dead, who should participate in the glory of Israel (Isa. xxxv. 19; Dan. xii. 2, 3). In the New Testament this view is again introduced, and the dying are represented as the "firstfruits" of the dead, and its language is with regard to the descent into Hades, punishment, purgatory, etc., the meaning of death, and the question of a future life, have engaged thought at all times; and hardly a people has been found destitute of all belief in a future existence.
Out of this relation grew the belief in the existence of the individual after death. Such passages, however, as Ps. xvi. 10 sq., xliii. 23 sqq., Job xix. 25–27, do not contain a clear and positive statement of the resurrection, but rather the kernel of hope and presentiment (Oehler and Schultz). The essential points of Old-Testament eschatology are the Messiah and his world-wide kingdom of peace and righteousness, and the sitting judgment upon God’s people and against the world that is at enmity with it. In the Apocrypha the national hope of the Messianic coming is intense, and pictured in rich colors; and at the side of this the belief in personal immortality is brought out, which was afterwards so strong among the Pharisees at the time of Christ.

From an eschatological point of view, as in other respects, our Lord did not destroy, but fulfilled, the passages in Psalms, and associated them with his own person. He gives prominence to the expectation of that kingdom, which was so universal among the Jews. He also predicted his second coming, which implies his resurrection. We must notice the construction he gives to the views he takes up. In the parables of the kingdom of heaven he confirms the expectation of a Messianic judgment, but gives it a purely moral (as opposed to a national) significance (Matt. viii. 11 sq.)(Matt. xiii. 43, 44 sqq., 1 sq.) All will be rewarded in the final adjudication, according to their relation to Christ, with full communion with God on the one hand, or unending death (not annihilation) on the other (Matt. vii. 21 sqq., xxv. 31 sqq.).

Of individual immortality our Lord speaks expressly only on special occasions, but then bases it upon our union with God (Matt. xxi. 23 sq.). Of this certainty the Gospel of John testifies most positively (iv. 14, v. 24, vi. 39 sqq., 28, xv. 25 sqq.).

In the writings of the apostles three things are to be noticed: (1) Their first preaching of the gospel gives prominence to eschatological subjects (Acts iv. 13 sqq.). (2) The hope of eternal life is associated immediately with the person of a risen Christ, who will return again (1 Cor. xv.; Eph. i. 18 sqq.; Col. iii. 3, 4; Heb. ix. 28; Jas. v. 1; 1 Pet. i. 7 sqq.; 1 John iii. 2, etc.). (3) This hope reaches out with confidence beyond this earthly development, and the moral distinction between heaven and earth shall be blotted out (1 Cor. xv. 44 sqq.; 2 Pet. iii. 10 sqq.; Rev. xxii. 22).

The Church, in its first period, opposed to heathenism and its pessimistic tendency a renunciation of the world, and a confident assurance of the victory with which it awaits the Lord and prosecutes the evangelization of the world. The second coming of Christ may be called the oldest church dogma (Dorner, Person of Christ). This early Chiliasm looked for an earthly Messianic kingdom. But, while the persecutions were still raging, the Church did not await the Lord and prosecuted the evangelization of the world. The Church ascended the Roman throne, eschatological questions were made to give way to the burning questions concerning the present. But the Greek Church still held firmly to that notion of the incarnation which makes it the implanting of the germ of eternal life in our nature (Dorner). The Church of the middle ages presumed to have a jurisdiction beyond the grave, and developed the ideas of purgatorial fire. It was this eschatological excrecence of a Pelagianizing hierarchy which gave the external occasion for the Reformation. Four points were taken up in the eschatology of the Protestant confessions, — death, the resurrection, the judgment, and the consummation, and stress laid upon the intimate connection of the second coming of the Messiah with the last enemy of heaven and earth shall be blotted out (1 Cor. xv. 28 sqq.).

Rationalism knew only of a certainty of immortality which was based upon philosophical reasoning, and the prevalence of the belief among different peoples (Wegscheider). This was followed by the pantheistic renunciation of individual immortality. Finally came the triumphant sneer against the future life, as the last enemy of speculative criticism (Strauss, Glaubenslehre, § 106 sqq.).

M. KAHLER.


ESCORIAL, or ESCURIAL, one of the most remarkable buildings in Europe, — at once a palace, a church, a convent, a mausoleum, and a museum, — is situated twenty-seven miles north-west of...
Madrid, at an elevation of thirty-five hundred feet above the level of the sea, in a barren and inhospitable waste. It was built by Philip II. (1590-1604), in honor of St. Lawrence, on whose day (Aug. 10) the battle of St. Quentin was won (1557). With an allusion to the martyrdom of the saint, the ground-plan of the whole ensemble of buildings shows the form of a gridiron; and, in spite of its splendor and real magnificence, it makes a most gloomy and dismal impression. The church, one of the noblest in Europe, is three hundred and forty feet long, two hundred feet broad, and three hundred and twenty feet high under the dome. The convent houses two hundred monks of the order of the Hieronymites. The picture-galley contains the masterpieces of Velasquez and Murillo.

ESDRAS. See Apocrypha, Old Testament.

ESDRAE'LIN. See JeZ'neEL.

ESNIK, b. at Kolp, near Mount Ararat, 397; d., as Bishop of Bagrewand, 478; was a pupil of Sahak and Mesrob; travelled in Mesopotamia, Syria, and Greece, whose language he learnt; took an active part in the conflict between the Christian Church in Armenia, and Parseeism, and wrote a book, which is still extant, against various views, some of which have a scientific interest, as, for instance, his Geschichte der Vulkata, Tubingen, 1824. His library is now in the Union Theological Seminary, New York City, and is extremely valuable, containing as it does that of the abbey of Marienmuinst, in the diocese of Paderborn, in 1790; was ordained priest in 1796; and lived thenceforward as a private gentleman. The translation of the New Testament, which he made in connection with his cousin Karl, appeared in 1807 at Brunswick, and ran through many editions. The first part of the translation of the Old Testament did not appear until 1822, the second followed, 1836; and the first edition of the whole Bible was published, 1840, at Sulzbach. He also gave out editions of the Vulgate (1822), the Septuagint (1824), and the Greek text of the New Testament (1827). Persecuted in every way by the Romanists for his zeal in spreading the Bible among laymen, he wrote a number of pamphlets in defence of his views, some of which have a scientific interest, as, for instance, his Geschichte der Vulkata, Tubingen, 1824. His library is now in the Union Theological Seminary, New York City, and is extremely valuable, containing as it does that of the abbey of Marienmunster. It consists of over 18,000 volumes, including 430 incunabula, 1,246 numbers of reformation literature in original editions, 37 manuscripts, about 200 editions of the Vulgate and of German Bibles (the earliest being 1470). It was bought in April, 1838, at the suggestion of Dr. E. Robinson, one of the professors of the seminary.

ESSENCE (Latin essentia, from esse, "to be") denotes that which makes a thing to be what it is. The schoolmen made a distinction between essence and substance, referring the former to the logical combination of qualities expressed in the definition, the latter to the abstract notion of matter underlying all existence. Ancient philosophy, however, did not know this distinction, the Greek ointoma denoting at once essence and substance; and so again in modern philosophy.

ESSENES, The. At the time when Christ appeared on earth, Judaism was divided into three religious parties,—the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. With the first two we are somewhat familiar from the New Testament, but not with the last, who were the object of admiration to Jews, heathens, and Christians, although their admirers are uncertain to this day whether they were Jews, or a school of Jewish proselytes, or, as Eusebius thinks, Christians. Sources. — The sources from which our information is derived concerning the Essenes are, chiefly, Josephus (Jewish War, II. 8, 13–18; Antiquities, XIII. 5, 9, XV. 10, 14, 5, XVIII. 1, 2–3), Philo (On the nature of God, ed. ii. 457–459) and Apology for the Jews (preserved by Eusebius, Prep. Evang., VIII. 11, also found in Mangely's ed. ii. 632–634), and Pliny (Nat. Hist., 6, 17). These sources were again made use of by Solinus, Porphyry, Eusebius, and Tatian, as well as Irenaeus, all of whom copy either the one or the other.

Name. — As to the name, which is variously
The best is probably that given by Ewald, according to whom it means "the Imus;" whilst Lightfoot prefers "the silent ones.

Interpretations. The best is probably that given by Ewald, according to whom it means "the Imus;" whilst Lightfoot prefers "the silent ones.

As difficult as the explanation of the name is the fixing of the precise date of their origin. The probable date may be derived from Josephus, who assigns their rise to the time when the Pharisees and Sadducees had their origin; that is, in the middle of the second century before Christ. But it is questionable whether they were the outgrowth of Judaism, or whether they stand between Judaism and Hellenism. They were allied to the Pharisees, and yet with very distinctive differences: they were zealous for the law, and yet transgressed it; they were righteous in the spirit of the prophets, and yet more painfully intent than the Pharisees on outward purification. They were Jews, and yet shut themselves out from the nation; servants of Jehovah, and yet praying, like the heathen, to the sun. "They were," as Keim remarks, "like a mosaic picture, with no inward unity,—a phenomenon of religious despair."

Organization and Tenets. According to Philo and Josephus, the number of the Essenes amounted at their time to more than four thousand, and they lived exclusively in the Holy Land and in the adjoining parts of Syria. But Pliny found the Essenes also on the western side of the Dead Sea, near the city of Engeddi; and, if we may believe Josephus, they were found everywhere. They lived in a separate community, having everything in common. There existed no distinction among them. They lived peaceably with all men, reprobated slavery and war, and would not even manufacture any martial instruments whatever. They were governed by a president, who was elected by the whole body, and who also acted as judge of the community. All matters of the society were governed by a jury of at least a hundred members. A brother guilty of a gross offence was excommunicated, but received again after due repentance. Celibacy being the rule of the order, the ranks of the brotherhood had to be filled up by recruits from the Jewish community at large. They preferred taking children, whom they educated most carefully, and taught the practices of the order. Every grown-up candidate, upon entering the order, had to cast all his possessions into the common treasury. He then received a copy of the regulations of the brotherhood, a spade to bury the excrement, an apron to be used at lustrations, and a white robe to put on at meals. He was not at once admitted, but had to pass through a novitiate of twelve months, when he was admitted to the lustrations. Then followed another novitiate of two years; and at the end of this period he was admitted to the common meals, after having bound himself by a most solemn oath not to divulge anything to outsiders, and to be open with the members of the order.

In order not to come in contact with such as did not practise the laws of Levitical purity, the Essenes raised the example of all their brethren. Each one of the community took his share of work in the department in which he most excelled. Some were tillers of the ground; others tended flocks, and reared bees; some prepared the food; some made articles of dress; some attended to the sick, and some instructed the young; whilst all of them devoted certain hours to studying the mysteries of nature and revelation, and of the celestial hierarchy. They always got up before the sun rose, and never talked about any worldly matters till they had all assembled together, and, with their faces turned towards the sun, offered up their prayer. This done, every one betook himself to his allotted work. They remained at their work till about eleven o'clock A.M., when they assembled together for a common bath. Having put on their white robes, they entered, with great solemnity, the refectory, to partake of the common meal, which was very simple, consisting chiefly of vegetables. The blessing having been invoked by the priest, the repast commenced. The deepest silence reigned throughout, to be interrupted only by the priest, who concluded the meal by offering thanks, which was the sign of dismissal. Thereupon all withdrew, dressed themselves in their working-dress, resumed their several employments till the evening, when they assembled again in the aforesaid manner to partake of a common meal. Whilst every thing was done according to the directions of the overseers, yet they were at liberty to act as they pleased in relieving the distressed with as much money as they thought proper, and to manifest their compassion for those who were not of the brotherhood as much as they liked and whenever they liked. Such was their mode of living during the week.

The Sabbath was observed very strictly. They prepared the food on the previous day in order that no fire need be lighted on the Sabbath, and did not dare to remove a vessel from its place on that day. They even restrained the necessities of the body. The whole day was given up to religious exercises and to exposition of the Scriptures. In the synagogue, as at meals, each one took his seat according to age, in becoming attire. One read aloud out of the law of their land, and the most experienced among them expounded, clothing the mystery in symbols. The others remained quiet, only giving a sign of assent or distrust with the head; whilst, of them devoted to abstinence they went even so far as to abstain from anointing the body, which in hot climates is almost a necessity of life.

Theology of the Essenes. They had a tendency to sun-worship. This tendency is rather a foreign element in Judaism. As has already been indicated above, at daybreak they addressed certain prayers to the sun, "as if entreating him to rise." They were careful, also, to conceal and bury all polluting substances, so as not "to insult the rays of the god." They denied the resurrection of the body, but believed in the immortality of the soul. Whilst they refused to offer sacrifices at Jerusalem, they sent gifts to the temple. They believed in angels; and to conceal the names of the angels was included in the oath taken by the candidate. They studied sacred books, which, however, are not described. They also learnt the qualities of roots and the properties of stones. By means of these and similar studies connected with their lustrations, the Essenes believed to have been enabled to foretell the future; and Josephus...
affirms, that in their prophecies, they seldom erred, giving some examples of fulfilled prophecies.

The question has been raised, and has been agitated by Continental scholars, whence Essenism derived its foreign influences, which distinguished it from Pharisaic Judaism; for, although many of the points of resemblance which distinguish Essenism could be traced back to Judaism, yet there is an alien admixture of foreign elements which could hardly be reconciled with Judaism. Some have regarded the distinctive characteristics of the sect as an offshoot of the Neo-Pythagorean school grafted on the stem of Judaism. This solution is suggested by the statement of Josephus, that "they practise the mode of life which among the Greeks was introduced by Pythagoras." This theory has found its ablest and most persistent advocate in Zeller, who draws out the parallels with great force and precision ("Geschichte der Philosophie der Griechen," III, 2, p. 281). This theory of Zeller was objected to by Lightfoot from a chronological and geographical standpoint, showing, on the one hand, the priority of Essenism to Neo-Pythagoreanism, and, on the other hand, that Essenism (having its home on the eastern borders of Palestine, the shores of the Dead Sea) was least of all exposed to the influences of Greek philosophy. Lightfoot is rather inclined to trace the tenets of Essenism back to the influence of Parseism, and makes his assertion good by drawing out the parallels between both. Which of the two theories is the correct one is hard to decide. This much is certain, that the theories of Jewish and Christian writers who would explain Essenism from a Talmudic standpoint have no foundation at all.

Of greater importance, however, is the question as to the relationship between—

Essenism and Christianity.—It has become a common practice with a certain class of Jewish and Christian writers to call Essenism to their aid in accounting for any distinctive features of Christianity. We cannot enter into a refutation of the points of resemblance between Essenism and Christianity adduced by Graetz and Ginsburg. This theory has been ably treated and refuted by Lightfoot. Suffice it to say that Essenism, notwithstanding all its favorable effect upon individuals, had no influence upon the Jewish people in particular, or upon the world in general. "Essenism," as Keim says, "was, in fact, only an admission of helplessness against the actual state of things, renouncing the attempt to restore all Israel, to which it was opposed as heretical and impure. . . . In short, the salvation of individuals in the general shipwreck is frankly the watchword of the party. We hear nothing from the Oriental monarch now changes his mind towards Haman, his wounded pride at the refusal of Mordecai to bend before him, and his such writers as Graetz and Ginsburg.

The scene is laid in Susa, at the court of Ahasuerus (Xerxes). The book opens with the description of a great feast for the princes of the empire (488 B.C.), the deposition of Queen Vashti for refusal to comply with the king's request (i. 12), and the elevation of Esther to the throne. The narrative then dwells upon the power of the prime minister Haman, his wounded pride at the refusal of Mordecai to bend before him, and his such writers as Graetz and Ginsburg.

The whole narrative is vividly written, and the reader is carried along with the interest of a true story. The book closes with the appointment of a national festival to commemorate the deliverance, and a notice of the advancement of Mordecai to Haman's place of power. The whole narrative is told with consummate dramatic skill. It gives us a striking illustration of patriotism, a stern warning against pride and contempt for inferiors, and shows how the self-sacrificing devotion of the heroine fits in with the workings of Divine Providence to defeat the plot of the enemy.

The authorship has been attributed to Morde-
cai (Clement of Alexandria), Ezra (Augustine), and Joiakim, the high priest. These names are nothing more than conjectures. But the references to Abaenurus and Mecucal (comp. i. 1 sqq. x. 1 sqq.) make it necessary that the work should have been written after their death. As to the time of composition, we can only speak with probability. Eichhorn, Keil, and others put it in the reign of Artaxerxes I. (464-425 B.C.); but the references to Persian customs, and the absence of all allusion to Palestine.

The authenticity has been questioned, but without good reason. The allusions to Persian manners are minute and accurate. The luxurious habits and capricious temper of Xerxes are in exact accord with the portraiture of secular history. The great assembly of his princes, recorded in chap. i., agrees with the statement of Herodotus, that the king began to make preparations for his Grecian campaign in the third year of his reign. That Herodotus does not mention Esther (for Amestris cannot be identified with her) offers no difficulty when we remember that Persian monarchs did not limit themselves to one wife. But an irrefutable argument for the truth of the narrative is the Feast of Purim, which commemorates the facts, and is inexplicable on any other hypothesis than that they occurred.

The religious character of the work has from the earliest times been the subject of unfavorable criticism. It makes not a single mention of God by name, and yet mentions the Persian monarch a hundred and eighty-seven times. Luther speaks of its marked Judaistic features, and its heathen frivolity, and thought it unworthy of a place in the canon. Others have spoken of the spirit of national revenge and pride which pervades it (De Wette). But, in spite of these criticisms, the book is not irreligious in tone. And, if the religious allusions are few, this is due to the fear of profaning the sacred in a book which was to be read at joyous feasts. The canonicity of Esther was at one time questioned in the Jewish Church, as we infer from the conduct of the eighty-five elders in opposing the observance of the Feast of Purim. In the early Greek Church it was placed by some (e.g., Athanasius) amongst the Apocrypha; but the Latin Church always held it to be canonical.

In the Septuagint Esther appears with apocryphal additions, which were no doubt made by some Hellenistic Jew. They bear on their face the marks of being spurious, inaccurate as their references to Persian customs are, and designed as their frequent mention of the name of God is, to give to the original work a specifically religious character.

Lit. — Besides the various Introductions to the O.T., by BLEEK, KEIL, etc., see G. RAWLINSON, in the Speaker’s Commentary (London and N.Y., 1873); F. W. SCHULTZ, in Lange (Bielefeld, 1875, Eng. trans., N.Y., 1877); B. NETZER (Munster, 1877); P. CASSEL (1. Abth., Berlin, 1878); A. RALEIGH (Lond., 1880); see also, Lectures on Esther, by THOMAS McCRIE (Edinb., 1838) and A. DAVIDSON (Edinb., 1859); L. MUNK’S Ger. trans. of the Targum Scheni to Esther (Berlin, 1876); A. WUNSCH’S Ger. trans. of the Midrash to Esther (Leipzig, 1881); and art. Esther, in Smith’s Dict. of the Bible, and by Professor CHEYNE, in his Lectures on Esther, by HOMAS MCCRIE (Edinb., 1878); A. RAILED (Lond., 1880); see, also, ESTIUS, Gulielmus (William van Est), b. at Goskum, 1542; d. at Douai, Sept. 20, 1613; studied at Utrecht and Leyden, and was appointed professor of theology at Louvain, 1570, and at Douai, 1580. His Commentarius in Epistolam Apostolicam (Douai, 1614-16, last edition by Franz Sausen, Mayence, 1841-42, 7 vols.) acquired great reputation for its acuteness both among Roman-Catholic and Protestant students. He also wrote commentaries on Petrus Lombardus.

**ETERNAL LIFE.** See IMMORTALITY.

**ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.** See Punishment, Future.

**ETHELBERT, or AETHELBERHT, d. Feb. 24, 616; king of Kent 560-616, and, since 593, bretwalda among the Anglo-Saxon kings; married Bertha, a daughter of Charibert, king of Paris, and allowed her to practise her own Christian religion at the old Roman-British Church of St. Martin, in Canterbury, under the guardianship of her bishop, Liudhard, but seems to have taken no further interest in the peculiar faith of his wife. When Augustine, however, landed at the Isle of Thanet in 597, he was well received by Ethelbert, who was converted and baptized in the very same year; and it seems that Ethelbert henceforward used all his influence as king and bretwalda for the promotion of Christianity. He removed the royal residence to Reculver (Regulbium), and left Canterbury to Augustine; he aided in the rebuilding of the old Roman church, and himself built a large monastery (St. Augustine) outside the walls of Canterbury; and, among the ninety dooms and decrees of his which are extant (Thorpe: Ancient Laws and Institutes of England), one makes provision for the security of the property of the church and the ecclesiastical officials. He issued (600) the earliest code of Anglo-Saxon laws now extant. He founded the see of Canterbury (602) and that of Rochester (604).

**ETHELREDA, St., a daughter of the East Anglian king, Anna, made a vow that she would remain a virgin, and kept her word, though she was twice married, first to Tondbert, an East-Anglian prince, who died shortly after the marriage, and then to Egfrid, King of Northumbria, from whom she was divorced. After the divorce had taken place (671), she retired to the Isle of Ely, where she led a life of severe asceticism, and died from the plague, June 23, 679. See BUTLER: Lives of Saints, June 23.

**ETERIDGE, John Wesley, a Methodist Orientalist; b. at Grangewood, near Newport, Isle of Wight, Feb. 24, 1804; d. at Camborne, May 24, 1880. Although not a university man, he made himself master of Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, French, and German. He was nearly all his life a circuit preacher, yet found time to prepare valuable books showing biblical and linguistic
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ETHICS, from the Greek ἔθικη, which, besides the objective element (customs, habits, the Latin mores, whence disciplina moralis), also includes a subjective element, a conscious feeling at home in the customs, an approval by conscience of the habits, which transforms the merely mechanical routine into responsible action, and elevates the merely instinctive disposition to character. Ethics is the science of conduct; Christian ethics, the scientific representation of the truths of Christianity in their practical application to individual life as duties and ideals. (Philosophical ethics, see Moral Philosophy.) In the science of divinity considered as an organic whole ethics occupies a position of its own as one part of systematic theology. From exegesis and church history it is distinguished by its very object; for it is neither a demonstration of what, according to the authentic documents of the divine revelation, is true Christianity, nor a record of what, in the course of history, as vindicated by systematic theology, the Holy Spirit communicates with the congregation. And consequently demanded absolute obedience to the dictates of this ecstatic prophecy as a condition of communion between the spirit and the individual, the Novatians found the true vehicle of spiritual communion in the church itself considered as a totality, as an organization of the universal priesthood under presbyterial forms; and they were consequently very rigorous with respect to admission to membership. Cyprian opposed both parties, and did so in favor of the hierarchical development of the idea of the church. Though he asserted the possibility of a second history, has vindicated the utility of a church of saints, he agreed with the Novatians in the holiness of the church as a totality; but this totality he found represented by the episcopacy, which, in its nature and essence, is one and undivided, though in reality it is distributed over a plurality of individuals. With this idea of the episcopacy as the true expression of the unity of the church, he turned upon the Montanists, and opposed to their abrupt, sporadic, and incidental ecstasies the sacrament of ordination as the true medium of communion between the spirit and the church. He did not go the full length, however, of his own argument. He never dared assert the infallibility and personal holiness followed as necessary effects of the sacrament. He demanded blind obedience to the bishop, but he granted that the congregation might expel an unholy and unworthy bishop. He stopped in a self-contradiction. The Council of Nicea led the way, the wutius, Hermas, Clemens Romanus). Still more deeply Tertullian penetrated into the subject in his numerous ethical writings,—De spectaculis, De velandia virginibus, De monogamia, De panentheismo, etc., everywhere expounding his peculiar conception of Christianity as a spiritual power which shall keep aloof from the pagan world, organize its children into a compact army, attack Paganism in closed ranks, conquer it, judge it. Starting from quite a different conception of Christianity, and not at all afraid of losing elements of the philosophy of the Christian, Clemens Alexandrinus develops a number of striking ethical ideas in his Pedagogus, Stromata, Exhortation to the Pagans, etc. To him Christianity is a spiritual power, which certainly raises the soul far above any epicurean eudemonism, or stoical apathy, or merely negative asceticism, but whose proper task it is to get itself naturalized in the world, to penetrate its very fibre, to regenerate it. With Cyprian (De ecclesiis unitatis, De observatione discipline, etc.) the church comes into prominence in the sphere of ethics, not simply as governing Christian life, legislating for it, influencing it in many various ways, but as the very centre of the whole field of ethics: to every Christian individual his relation to the church now becomes the principal ethical relation of his life. The full realization of this idea was the result of a long development; but in this development Cyprian occupies a central position. His views were the natural outcome of the Montanist and the Novatian movements; and they reached their perfection by Augustine's victory over the Donatists. While the Montanists accepted the sudden outbursts of individual enthusiasm as the true medium through which the Holy Spirit communicates with the congregation, and consequently demanded absolute obedience to the dictates of this ecstatic prophecy as a condition of communion between the spirit and the individual, the Novatians found the true vehicle of spiritual communion in the church itself considered as a totality, as an organization of the universal priesthood under presbyterial forms; and they were consequently very rigorous with respect to admission to membership. Cyprian opposed both parties, and did so in favor of the hierarchical development of the idea of the church. Though he asserted the possibility of a second history, has vindicated the utility of a church of saints, he agreed with the Novatians in the holiness of the church as a totality; but this totality he found represented by the episcopacy, which, in its nature and essence, is one and undivided, though in reality it is distributed over a plurality of individuals. With this idea of the episcopacy as the true expression of the unity of the church, he turned upon the Montanists, and opposed to their abrupt, sporadic, and incident al ecstatics the sacrament of ordination as the true medium of communion between the spirit and the church. He did not go the full length, however, of his own argument. He never dared assert the infallibility and personal holiness followed as necessary effects of the sacrament. He demanded blind obedience to the bishop, but he granted that the congregation might expel an unholy and unworthy bishop. He stopped in a self-contradiction. The Council of Nicea led the way, the wutius, Hermas, Clemens Romanus). Still more deeply Tertullian penetrated into the subject in his numerous ethical writings,—De spectaculis, De velandia virginibus, De monogamia, De panentheismo, etc., everywhere expounding his peculiar conception of Christianity as a spiritual power which shall keep aloof from the pagan world, organize its children into a compact army, attack Paganism in closed ranks, conquer it, judge it. Starting from quite a different conception of Christianity, and not at all afraid of losing elements of the philosophy of the Christian, Clemens Alexandrinus develops a number of striking ethical ideas in his Pedagogus, Stromata, Exhortation to the Pagans, etc. To him Christianity is a spiritual power, which certainly raises the soul far above any epicurean eudemonism, or stoical apathy, or merely negative asceticism, but whose proper task it is to get itself naturalized in the world, to penetrate its very fibre, to regenerate it. With Cyprian (De ecclesiis unitatis, De observatione discipline, etc.) the church comes into prominence in the sphere of ethics, not simply as governing Christian life, legislating for it, influencing it in many various ways, but as the very centre of the whole field of ethics: to every Christian individual his relation to the church now becomes the principal ethical relation of his life. The full realization of this idea was the result of a long development; but in this development Cyprian occupies a central position. His views were the natural outcome of the Montanist and the Novatian movements; and they reached their perfection by Augustine's victory over the Donatists. While the Montanists accepted the sudden outbursts of individual enthusiasm as the true medium through which the Holy Spirit communicates with the congregation, and consequently demanded absolute obedience to the dictates of this ecstatic prophecy as a condition of communion between the spirit and the individual, the Novatians found the true vehicle of spiritual communion in the church itself considered as a totality, as an organization of the universal priesthood under presbyterial forms; and they were consequently very rigorous with respect to admission to membership. Cyprian opposed both parties, and did so in favor of the hierarchical development of the idea of the church. Though he asserted the possibility of a second history, has vindicated the utility of a church of saints, he agreed with the Novatians in the holiness of the church as a totality; but this totality he found represented by the episcopacy, which, in its nature and essence, is one and undivided, though in reality it is distributed over a plurality of individuals. With this idea of the episcopacy as the true expression of the unity of the church, he turned upon the Montanists, and opposed to their abrupt, sporadic, and incident al ecstatics the sacrament of ordination as the true medium of communion between the spirit and the church. He did not go the full length, however, of his own argument. He never dared assert the infallibility and personal holiness followed as necessary effects of the sacrament. He demanded blind obedience to the bishop, but he granted that the congregation might expel an unholy and unworthy bishop. He stopped in a self-contradiction. The Council of Nicea led the way, the wutius, Hermas, Clemens Romanus). Still more deeply Tertullian penetrated into the subject in his numerous ethical writings,—De spectaculis, De velandia virginibus, De monogamia, De panentheismo, etc., everywhere ex-
especially the Lutheran Church, in the beginning, when the Donatists, nevertheless, vehemently urged the holiness of the bishop as an absolute condition of the holiness of the church, Augustine was naturally led to object, that, in that case, the whole idea was reduced to something merely subjective, and quite impalpable. It is not necessary, he said, that the sacrament of ordination shall confer personal infallibility and personal holiness on the ordained: it is sufficient, when it gives authority in teaching, efficacy in the administration of the sacraments, and power to govern the congregation; for the church is holy, not on account of the holiness of its members, but because it is a divine institution: its holiness is impersonal. Thereby the foundation was laid for the hierarchical fabric soon to be reared, and thereby the ethical relation between the church and the individual was fixed in a manner soon to become strikingly apparent; for the more vigorously the church developed as a divine institution, the holy see, more clearly its ethics assumed the aspect of a criminal code. A new, so-called higher virtue, with the character of a pre-eminently negative asceticism, and blooming forth in monasticism, virginity, poverty, etc., became the real focus of Christian life, and found in the penitential its true literary expression. Ethical studies, in the broader and sounder sense of the word, were few and far between; nor do they generally evince any marked originality. Innumerable: some of the most prominent are the fathers, and the canons of the councils, the pre-eminently negative asceticism, and blooming forth in monasticism, virginity, poverty, etc., became the real focus of Christian life, and found in the penitential its true literary expression. Ethical studies, in the broader and sounder sense of the word, were few and far between; nor do they generally evince any marked originality. Innumerable: some of the most prominent are the fathers, and the canons of the councils, the religious relationship of ethics were extracted from the apostolical constitutions, the fathers, and the canons of the councils) were innumerable: some of the most prominent are those made by Johannes Jejunator, Fulgentius Ferrandus, Cresconius, Theodorus Cilix, Bede, and Rhabanus Maurus.

The medieval mystics is also ascetic, but the asceticism is there of another and higher type. By John Scotus Erigena the Greek mysticism — represented by Makarius the Egyptian, Dionysius Areopagita, and Maximus Confessor — was introduced into the Latin world, and became the starting-point of the mysticism of the Western Church, both in its Romanic form (Hugo and Richard of St. Victor, Bernard of Clairvaux, Bonaventura, Gerson, Molino) and in its Germanic form (Suso, Ruybrooke, Tauler, Eckart). So far as this mysticism developed an ethics, the principle of the false asceticism was retained. The contradiction between finite and infinite, matter and spirit, world and God, was left standing. To escape from the finite, to die away from the world, to crush the flesh, was still considered the only true ethical process. But to this mere negation was added a positive object, — to be absorbed by the infinite, to arrive at spiritual freedom, to live in God; and thereby the mainspring of Christian ethics was actually touched. When, nevertheless, the medieval mystics failed to produce a true ethics, the reason was that they lacked that conception of the human personality which achieves a perfect union of finite and infinite by means of the created soul's capability to receive the divine character. And it was only after the first obtained full scope in Luther's doctrine of faith and justification by faith. Alongside with the mystics — who, in spite of all shortcomings, form the real sap-carrying vessels both of ethics and dogmatics during the middle ages — the scholastics went their own way, in some respects continuators, they too, of asceticism, though generally more deeply engaged in other directions. After the example of Petrus Lombardus, they used to incorporate a certain amount of ethical materials with their dogmatic sententiae and summae. To the four theological virtues — justitia, fortitudo, moderatio, and sapientia — the three theological virtues were added, — faith, hope, and charity; thus making the sacred seven full. The internal relation, however, between these two groups of virtues always remained somewhat vague. The best treatment which the subject found among the scholastics was that by Thomas Aquinas, in his Prima et secunda secundae, which became the model for all later Roman-Catholic ethics.

When the Reformation took its final stand upon Scripture, it not only escaped the great errors of the middle ages, but it also succeeded in establishing the true principles of Christian ethics. By the new doctrines of faith, and justification by faith, the fundamental ethical ideas of duty, virtue, and highest good, were, so to speak, melted down and recast. A new ethics appeared, bearing the characteristic marks of the double development of the Protestant or evangelical principle, — the Lutheran Church, with its talent for plastic representation, art, hynology, science; and the Reformed Church, with its talent for practical action, discipline, missions, statesmanship. Though neither Luther nor Calvin has written on ethics, in the proper sense of the word, both have occasionally treated of various ethical subjects, such as prayer, oath, marriage, civil authority, etc., especially in the form of expositions of the Decalogue in the Catechism. The Catechism is, indeed, the primitive form of evangelical ethics. Just as evangelical dogmatics arose from the regula fidei and the apostolic symbolum, so evangelical ethics grew out of the Decalogue. The religious relations of ethics were treated under the first three Commandments, — more especially the doctrines of worship, prayer, and devotion, under the third, — family, education, school, state, and civil authority, under the fourth; the duties towards our neighbors, temperance, care of the body, also the question of capital punishment, under the fifth; marriage and chastity, under the sixth; property and honor, under the seventh and eighth. Even the scientific writers returned to the form; as, for instance, David Chytreaeus (Virtutum descriptiones, 1555), Paul von Eifzen (Ethico doctrina libri IV., 1571), Lambert Danes (Ethics Christianae, Geneva, 1577). Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that the evangelical churches, especially the Lutheran Church, in the beginning,
showed a lack of fertility in the field of ethical science; and the reason seems to have been a certain awkwardness in the establishment of the true relation between philosophical and theological ethics. The new principle was obtained in the doctrines of faith, and justification by faith. Materials were plentifully at hand in the works of the ancient philosophical ethics; but the evangelical theologians felt a certain shyness when applying the new principle to the old materials, and for some time this, the most fertile of all ethical principles, was left in a state of lonesome grandeur, like a king without subjects. Melanchthon, in his *Philosophia moralis* (1530) and *Enarratio aliquot librorum Aristotelis* (1545), derived his whole system from general human consciousness and philosophical knowledge, without attempting to give to Christian ethics an entirely new shape by the application of the principle of faith. In his *Systema ethicum* (Geneva, 1614), Keckermann places the philosophical ethics after the theological, as the practical part. The theological ethics deals only with *via interior*, the *bonum gravis*, the *vir pius et religiosus*; the philosophical, only with the *bonum civile*, the *vir virilis, the vir prudentius et honestus*. Less mechanical was Calixtus, in his *Epitome theologiae moralis*, Helmstadt, 1634. He distinguishes between philosophical and theological ethics by distinguishing between a natural and a supernatural law; but he defines both laws as eternal, and ascribes to human nature an ineradicable right within Christianity, and to Christianity an internal affinity to human reason. What was needed as a preparation for a completely harmonious union of the philosophical and theological principles in ethics was an independent development of each of them; and a development in that direction—in the direction of the emancipation of the philosophical principle—began with Hugo Grotius, Puffendorf, and Thomasius. In his *De jure pacis et belli* (Paris, 1625), Grotius defines the highest good, and the duty therein involved, as the weal of the community. His antagonist, Schomer, proposed as the fundamental ethical maxim, *Follow Reason and her innate ideas*. Lorenz von Mosheim finally introduced the principle of happiness in ethics, and thereby opened the long series of eudemonistic attempts. On the other hand, Buddeus (*Institutiones theologicae moralis*, 1711), J. F. Reuss (*Elementa theologica moralis*, 1787), and C. A. Crusius (*Moraltheologie*, Leipzig, 1772), developed the principle of faith as the true principle of Christian ethics, defining the highest good as the kingdom of heaven, though placing the kingdom of heaven in a somewhat more popular character. The ethics of the Roman-Catholic Church continued, from the middle ages down to the eighteenth century, to run along in the two above described parallel lines,—scholasticism and mysticism. The peculiar legalism of the former is often apparent from the very title of their works,—*De juris et jure* (*Christliche Ethik*; Erlangen, 1872 sqq., 2 vols.);—J. Chr. von Hofmann (*Theologische Ethik*, Nordlingen, 1878) and H. Martensen (*Den christelige Ethik*, Copenhagen, 1871–78, 3 vols., Eng. trans., Edinburgh, 1873–82, 3 vols.);—though both are of a somewhat more popular character.

The ethics of the Roman-Catholic Church continued, from the middle ages down to the eighteenth century, to run along in the two above described parallel lines,—scholasticism and mysticism. The peculiar legalism of the former is often apparent from the very title of their works,—*De juris et jure* (*Christliche Ethik*; Erlangen, 1872 sqq., 2 vols.);—J. Chr. von Hofmann (*Theologische Ethik*, Nordlingen, 1878) and H. Martensen (*Den christelige Ethik*, Copenhagen, 1871–78, 3 vols., Eng. trans., Edinburgh, 1873–82, 3 vols.);—though both are of a somewhat more popular character. The ethics of the Roman-Catholic Church continued, from the middle ages down to the eighteenth century, to run along in the two above described parallel lines,—scholasticism and mysticism. The peculiar legalism of the former is often apparent from the very title of their works,—*De juris et jure* (*Christliche Ethik*; Erlangen, 1872 sqq., 2 vols.);—J. Chr. von Hofmann (*Theologische Ethik*, Nordlingen, 1878) and H. Martensen (*Den christelige Ethik*, Copenhagen, 1871–78, 3 vols., Eng. trans., Edinburgh, 1873–82, 3 vols.);—though both are of a somewhat more popular character. The ethics of the Roman-Catholic Church continued, from the middle ages down to the eighteenth century, to run along in the two above described parallel lines,—scholasticism and mysticism. The peculiar legalism of the former is often apparent from the very title of their works,—*De juris et jure* (*Christliche Ethik*; Erlangen, 1872 sqq., 2 vols.);—J. Chr. von Hofmann (*Theologische Ethik*, Nordlingen, 1878) and H. Martensen (*Den christelige Ethik*, Copenhagen, 1871–78, 3 vols., Eng. trans., Edinburgh, 1873–82, 3 vols.);—though both are of a somewhat more popular character. The ethics of the Roman-Catholic Church continued, from the middle ages down to the eighteenth century, to run along in the two above described parallel lines,—scholasticism and mysticism. The peculiar legalism of the former is often apparent from the very title of their works,—*De juris et jure* (*Christliche Ethik*; Erlangen, 1872 sqq., 2 vols.);—J. Chr. von Hofmann (*Theologische Ethik*, Nordlingen, 1878) and H. Martensen (*Den christelige Ethik*, Copenhagen, 1871–78, 3 vols., Eng. trans., Edinburgh, 1873–82, 3 vols.);—though both are of a somewhat more popular character. The ethics of the Roman-Catholic Church continued, from the middle ages down to the eighteenth century, to run along in the two above described parallel lines,—scholasticism and mysticism. The peculiar legalism of the former is often apparent from the very title of their works,—*De juris et jure* (*Christliche Ethik*; Erlangen, 1872 sqq., 2 vols.);—J. Chr. von Hofmann (*Theologische Ethik*, Nordlingen, 1878) and H. Martensen (*Den christelige Ethik*, Copenhagen, 1871–78, 3 vols., Eng. trans., Edinburgh, 1873–82, 3 vols.);—though both are of a somewhat more popular character.
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Isaac August Doerner.

ETHIOPIA. See Abyssinian Church.

ETHIOPIC VERSION. See Bible Versions, VII.

ETHNARCH (ἐθναρχή, "ruler of a nation") was the title of a ruler or prince, who, though not fully independent, or possessed of royal power, nevertheless governed his people according to their national laws. It was specially applicable to the Jews, after their relations with the Romans had begun, and several of their rulers bore it; as, for instance, Simon (1 Mac. xiv. 47), his son Hyrcanus (Josephus, Arch., 14, 6, 5), and Archelaus, the son and successor of Herod the Great. He afterwards retired to the Island of Lero (St. Marguerite), where he lived as a hermit till 394, when he was elected Bishop of Lyons. He has left several works, among which are Epistolat de contentu mundi et secularis, syphilis (printed by Rosweid, Antwerp, 1621), Epistolat de laude eremi (edited by Rhenanus, Basel, 1516, and by Erasmus, Basel, 1520), Liber formularum spirituum (ed. Paulus, Graz, 1894). There are collected editions by Brascianus (Basel, 1551), also in Biblioth. Patr. Max. (Lyón, Tom. VI.), and in Migne, Patro. Lat., vol. 50, containing, however, many spurious writings. See A. Meller: De vita et scriptis sancti Eucherii, Lyon, 1878; A. Gouillard: Saint Eucher, Lérins et l'église de Lyon au V e siècle, Lyon, 1881.

EUDES. See Messalians.

EUCHERIUS. See Messalians.

EUDEOLOGION (εὐχολογίαν, "collection of prayers") is in the later Greek Church the common name for books on liturgy, and rituals. It occurs for the first time in the writings of Anastasius Sinaita (Quer. 141) in the sixth century, but is afterwards very frequent in the liturgical works of the Byzantines. Numerous manuscripts of books of this kind, in which the Greek Church was much richer than the Latin, are found in the libraries of Venice, Rome (Bibliotheca Barboniana), Paris, Venice, etc., among other nations. Thus King Aretas had settled an ethnarch at Damascus (2 Cor. xi. 32).

ETSHMIADZIN, or ECHMIEDZIN, a famous monastery situated fifteen miles west of the city of Erivan, in Asiatic Russia. It was founded in 524, contains a valuable library, is the seat of the Catholicos, or patriarch of the whole Armenian Church.

ETTEWIN, John, a Moravian bishop; b. at Frenedenstadt, Württemberg, June 29, 1721; d. Jan. 2, 1802. In 1754 he emigrated to America, and labored efficiently as evangelist and bishop. In 1760 he had the Command of the Pennsylvania-Border, and led the Brethren across the Alleghenies to the Tuscarawas in Ohio. He enjoyed friendly intercourse with Washington, and devoted himself to the care of the sick soldiers in the general army hospital at Bethlehem, Penn. In 1784 he was appointed to the presidency of the University of Pittsburgh, and founded an independent congregation — the Eudists, or the Congregation of Jesus and Mary — for the education of priests and for missions among the clergy. The congregation, however, never attained any great

EUCHARIUS was, together with Valerius and Maternus, sent by the apostle Peter across the Alps to preach the gospel in the Valley of the Rhine, and occupied the episcopal chair of Treves for twenty-five years. According to the criticism of the Bollandists he belongs to the second half of the third century; and the legends of his missions and miracles are mere fables.

EUQUELAIION, if, giving a survey of the history of Roman Catholic ethics. It is one counted it one of the seven sacraments of the church, and corresponds to the extreme unction of the Roman Church, but is not limited to cases of mortal illness. See Extreme Unction.

EUCHERIUS, St., d. about 450; was b. at Lyons, of a distinguished family, and was a senator, and married; when, in 422, he entered the monastery of Lerinum, and became a monk. He afterwards retired to the island of Leró (St. Marguerite), where he lived as a hermit till 394, when he was elected Bishop of Lyons. He has left several works, among which are Epistolat de contentum mundi et secularis philosophiae (edited by Rosweid, Antwerp, 1621), Epistolat de laude eremi (edited by Rhenanus, Basel, 1516, and by Erasmus, Basel, 1520), Liber formularum spirituum (ed. Paulus, Graz, 1894). There are collected editions by Brascianus (Basel, 1551), also in Biblioth. Patr. Max. (Lyón, Tom. VI.), and in Migne, Patro. Lat., vol. 50, containing, however, many spurious writings. See A. Meller: De vita et scriptis sancti Eucherii, Lyon, 1878; A. Gouillard: Saint Eucher, Lerins et l'église de Lyon au V e siècle, Lyon, 1881.

EUCH. See Messalians.

EUDEOLOGION (εὐχολογίαν, "collection of prayers") is in the later Greek Church the common name for books on liturgy, and rituals. It occurs for the first time in the writings of Anastasius Sinaita (Quer. 141) in the sixth century, but is afterwards very frequent in the liturgical works of the Byzantines. Numerous manuscripts of books of this kind, in which the Greek Church was much richer than the Latin, are found in the libraries of Venice, Rome (Bibliotheca Barboniana), Paris, Venice, etc., among other nations. A series of printed editions have appeared at Venice since 1526 (1544, 1553, 1570, etc.) but the best and most complete edition is that by Jacobus Goar, Paris, 1645.

EUDEMONISM. See Epicureanism.

EUDES, Jean, founder of the Eudists; b. at Mezerai, in Normandy, Nov. 14, 1601; d. at Caen, Aug. 19, 1680; was educated by the Jesuits at Caen; entered the Congregation of the Oratory in Paris, 1623; was ordained priest in 1625; labored among the plague-stricken people of Normandy and as a missionary among the clergy; was in 1638 made prior of the House of the Oratorians at Caen, but was shortly after called to Paris by Cardinal Richelieu, for the purpose of founding an ecclesiastical seminary. This plan was foiled by the death of the cardinal; but, on the advice of several bishops, Eudes, nevertheless, left his career, and founded an independent congregation — the Eudists, or the Congregation of Jesus and Mary — for the education of priests and for missions among the clergy. The congregation, however, never attained any great
EUHEMERUS.  

EUDEVA, Empress, wife of Theodosius II.; was b. at Athens; the daughter of a sophist; came while very young to Constantinople, where she captivated not only Pulcheria, but also her brother, with her accomplishments; was baptized, and married to the emperor, 410. The latter part of her married life was clouded, however, by some misunderstanding between her and her husband; and she lived, separated or divorced, in Palestine. Photius mentions several works by her, — a paraphrase in verse of the Pentateuch, Joshua, etc.; a poem on the martyrdom of St. Cyprian, etc., — and he praises them much; but they have not come down to us. She is also said to have finished the Centones Homerici of Patri- cius, — a life of Christ composed of verses, or fragments of verses, of Homer; printed at Francfort, 1541, Paris, 1578, and Leipzig, 1793.

EUDOXIA, Empress, wife of Arcadius; descended from a Frankish family; was married to the emperor, April 27, 305, and d. Nov. 6, 404. The origin of the enmity between her and Chrysostom is not clear, but she caused his banishment in 403. The horror which seized the inhabitants of Constantinople on account of an earthquake compelled her to recall him; but his denunciations of the Pagan chants and dances which accompanied the inauguration of her silver statue, raised in front of the Church of St. Sophia, exasperated her to such a degree, that she caused him to be banished a second time. See Chrysostom.

EUDOXIUS was made Bishop of Germanicia, on the confines of Syria, Cilicia, and Cappadocia, in 381, Bishop of Antioch in 347, and finally Patriarch of Constantinople in 360. He died in 403. The horror which seized the inhabitants of Constantinople on account of an earthquake compelled her to recall him; but his denunciations of the Pagan chants and dances which accompanied the inauguration of her silver statue, raised in front of the Church of St. Sophia, exasperated her to such a degree, that she caused him to be banished a second time. See Chrysostom.

EUGENIUS is the name of four popes. — Eugenius I. (Aug. 10, 669–June 1, 677) was a weak character, who for the sake of peace, and in order to escape the fate of his predecessor, Martin I., who had been sent in banishment by the emperor to the Thracic Chersonesus, made an agreement with Trynnus, Patriarch of Constantinople, and leader of the Monothelites, on the basis that Christ had neither one nor two wills, but three (unum super duas), — a compromise worthy of a farce. See JAFFE: Regent. Pont. Rom.; BOWER: History of the Popes, III. 70. — Eugenius II. (June, 824–August, 827) submitted with good grace to the imperial sway which Louis the Pious still exercised over the Church, in imitation of his father. Louis sent his son Lothair to Rome with an army, to establish order and peace in the city; and the decrees of a council which he convened at Paris (November, 825), and which decided the question of image-worship in the same spirit as the synod of Francfort, were accepted and confirmed by Eugenius, though without exercising any influence on the practice of the Roman Church. See JAFFE: Regent. Pont. Rom. — Eugenius III. (Feb. 18, 1145–July 8, 1153) was a monk from Citeaux, and a pupil of St. Bernard of Clairvaux. Immediately after his election, the Roman people rose, and demanded that he should content himself with the spiritual authority, and not claim secular power. He fled to Viterbo, laid interdict upon the rebellious city, and succeeded in returning in 1146. But in the mean time Arnold of Brescia had begun his stirring agitations; and Eugenius was compelled to flee a second time. Over Siena, Anghiari, and Brescia, the emperor, accompanied by St. Bernard, holding synods and conferences, and enjoying a good reception everywhere. By the aid of Roger of Sicily he was enabled to return to Rome in 1148; but in the beginning of 1150 he left the city again, driven away by the Republicans. He afterwards lived mostly at Segni. The principal event of his reign was the second crusade. His letters are found in JAFFE: Regent. Pont. Rom.; the sources of his life, in WATTERICH: Pont. Rom. Vite, II. — Eugenius IV. (March 3, 1431–Feb. 22, 1447) began his reign by stirring up the hatred of the family of Colonna against him. The Colonnas fled; and in the war which he waged, in connection with Florence and Venice, against Milan and Naples, they took the side of his enemies. One province of the Papal States was conquered after the other. In Rome rebellion broke out, and (June 4, 1433) Eugenius fled in disguise to Florence. But the greatest danger to him was the Council of Basel, opened Aug. 27, 1431. It first assumed the character of an episcopal aristocracy, and then changed into an ecclesiastical democracy; but under both forms it was in decided opposition to the Pope. Eugenius tried to dissolve it (1437), but failed. The council deposed him, and set up an antipope, Felix V. Meanwhile, Eugenius succeeded in convening a more tractable council at Ferrara (1438), which the following year was transferred to Florence; and the refractory council of Basel, and its antipope, gradually sank into insignificance. In his warfare he also experienced a change of fortune, especially after he abandoned his old allies, the republics, and united himself with his old enemies, the tyrants. In 1443 he was enabled to return to Rome. See BOWSER, Hist. of the Popes, VII. 238, and the sources to the history of the Council of Basel.

EUGIPPIUS, or EUGYPPIUS, a monk of Italian descent; lived for some time in the monastery of St. Severinus, near Fabianze, in Noricum; returned after the death of the saint, and carrying his remains with him, to Castrum Lucullum, near Naples, and wrote (in 511) a Vita St. Severini, often printed, best by Friedrich, at the end of the first volume of his Kirchengesch. Deutschlands. Besides this work, which is invaluable for the first period of the church history of Germany, he also compiled a Theaurus ex D. Augustini Operibus, Basel, 1542; wrote monastic rules, etc. See Opera, ed. Knoll, Wien, 1885.

EUHEMERUS, a Greek philosopher who flourished about 300 B.C.; was the originator of that principle of interpreting the Pagan mythology according to which each myth is supposed to have developed from some simple historical event as its kernel. This principle of interpretation, Eurheism, was afterwards much in favor with Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Lactantius, Chrysostom, and others of the church.
fathers. Of the works of Euhemerus, nothing has come down to us but a fragment of a Latin translation by Ennius.

EULALIUS was put up as antipope against Boniface I. (in 418) after the death of Zosimus, by a minority of the clergy of Rome, and the city prefect, Symmachus. The emperor convened a council to decide the question, and ordered the two contenders meanwhile to leave the city. Boniface obeyed; but Eulalius did not, and was consequently banished from the city by the emperor. He was afterwards made Bishop of Nepe, and kept quiet during the reign of Boniface I. After the death of the latter the friends of Eulalius wished him to step forward and try to enforce his claims; but he declined.

EULOGIUS OF CORDOVA was elected Archbishop of Toledo in 858, but by the Moors prevented from entering upon the duties of his office. He was a zealous champion of Christianity in its contest with Mohammedanism, and was beheaded March 11, 859, because he had been instrumental in the conversion of a young Moorish girl. His writings, among which his "Memoriale Sanctorum sine Libri III. de Martyribus Cordubensibus" occupies the chief place, were first printed by Peter Pontius Leo at Complutum, 1574. They are found, together with the commentaries of Ambrosius de Morales, in Andreas Schott's "Hispania Illustrata," IV., and, together with his life by his friend Alvarus of Cordova, in Migne, Pat. Lat., CXV. See BAUDISSIN: "Basilikon und Alcarius," Leipz., 1872.

EUNOMIUS and the EUNOMIANS. Eunomius, b. at Dacora, in Cappadocia, near Altisiris, on the Galatian frontier; d. there about 392; came in 356 to Alexandria to study under Aetius, whose pupil and amanuensis he became. He was an honest and robust but dry and mechanical nature; and in the most extreme Arianism—of Aetius and the Anomoeans—he found exactly what he sought. In 358 he accompanied Aetius to the Arian Council convened at Antioch by Eudoxius. The Semi-Arians were in power, and through various intrigues they succeeded in getting Aetius banished to Pepusa, and Eunomius to Migdia; while Eudoxius, retiring before the storm, retired into his native Armenia. Eudoxius, however, understood how to ingratiate himself with Constantius; and in 359 he was made Patriarch of Constantinople. Aetius could not or would not re-instate; but Eunomius was recalled, and made Bishop of Cysicus, 390. He remained there four years. In the beginning he refrained, at the instance of Eudoxius, from openly proclaiming his extreme Arian views; but hypocrisy was not his vice, and the contempt he felt for people who were not of his opinion soon made him forget all prudence. The inhabitants of Cyzicus repeatedly and bitterly complained of him and his heresies; and finally Eudoxius was compelled, by a direct order from the emperor, to summon him to Constantinople, and institute an investigation, the result of which was that he was deposed and banished. He then placed himself at the head of the Anomoeans (who from this time generally bore the name of the Eunomians), and wrote and spoke in their interest; but he never again held an official position in the church. He moved about from place to place, always in banishment.

In his treatment of the great question of his day,—the divinity of Christ,—he started from the conception of an absolute unlikeliness in substance between the Father and the Son, and was thereby led to represent the Son as a creature among other creatures, as a mere man. These views produced such an indignation, that successive imperial edicts ordered his books to be burnt. Of his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans and of his Letters (more than forty, according to Photius), nothing has come down to us. The Confession ("Echos tois pilatos"), which he presented to Theodosius in 383, but which was not accepted, was first printed by Valerius, in his "Notes to Socrates," then by Baluze, in his "Concil. Nov. Collect.," I. 80. Of his two Apologies, the first was written directly against the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity, the second as a defence against the attacks of Basil. From several manuscripts of the latter's work ("Adversus Eunomium") it has been possible to restore the whole first "Apologia" of Eunomius. The attempt was first made by CAV 

EUNUCH (lit. bed-keeper, chamberlain). This class of persons is a natural consequence of polygamy, and is numerous to-day throughout the East. Frequent mention is made of them upon Egyptian and Assyrian monuments, and they were common in the degenerate days of Greece and Rome. The men who sing soprano in the Sistine Chapel at Rome are Eunuchs. Eunuchs always display the same character: they are cowardly, jealous, intriguing, licentious, and shameless. They incline to melancholy, and frequently commit suicide. Yet they rose to the highest eminence, and were intrusted with the life of the sovereign.

According to Deut. xxiii. 1, eunuchs could not enter into the congregation of the Lord. In the Christian Church eunuchs could not be ordained.
History records a few instances of self-mutilation (of which the most famous is Origen) out of a fanatical or ascetic obedience to our Lord's words (Matt. xix. 22): "There are eunuchs who made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake." If, however, a man was a born eunuch, or was made one by his persecutors, the prohibition against ordination did not apply to him. Abelard was mutilated, but, notwithstanding, rose to be an abbot. In its mouth, and then, after solemn sacrifices, as before, the gods, dipped "the weapons of Assur" in the water, and set up his royal likeness.

EUPHRATES (Hebrew יְבַּרְתָּא; LXX. Εὐφράτης; Assyr. Purātē, Purātu, "the river") occurs (Gen. ii. 14, xv. 18; Deut. i. 7, xi. 24; Josh. i. 4; 2 Sam. viii. 3; 2 Kings xxiii. 29, xxiv. 7; 1 Chron. v. 9, xviii. 3; 2 Chron. xxxv. 20; Jer. xiii. 5, 8, 9, 11, 21; Exod. xxxii. 31; A. V. "flood," Josh. xiv. 14, 15), and even "river" (יוֹר, Isa. vii. 20; Jer. ii. 18; Mic. xii. 7). It takes its rise in the mountains of Armenia, its volume being due to the union of two streams, — the Murād Su or Eastern Euphrates, and the Frat or Northern Euphrates, — which unite about lat. 39° and long. 39°. The sources of the Euphrates are expressly mentioned by Salmanasar II. (B.C. 840-820), who relates how he marched from the sources of the Tigris to those of the Euphrates (probably meaning the sources of the Murād Su, north-east of Lake Van; the Frat, west of the city Dilmun, situated "thirty Kasbu" (about a hundred miles, from the Taurus range, entering from the north-east in lat. 35° 40' 9"; the Belik (Assyr. Bollā), entering from the north (below the great south-easterly bend), in long. 38° 9' 9"; and the Khabūr (Assyr. Ḥabbūr), entering from the north-east in lat. 35° 7', long. 40° 30'. From the Khabūr to the sea, a distance of eight hundred miles, there is no tributary, but, on the other hand, a tendency toward the mouth to divide into smaller streams. The melting of the mountain snows causes a yearly flood, beginning in March, and increasing gradually till May; when, after some weeks, the waters sink by degrees, until, in September or October, the river is at its lowest. Forming the western boundary of Mesopotamia proper, it was, of course, in ancient times, the limit of the various districts of that region inhabited largely by Aramean peoples, which gradually came under the control of Assyria; so that the expression "I crossed the Euphrates," denoted for an Assyrian king the beginning of a foreign campaign. It divided Mesopotamia from the "Land Hatti," a name, which, from the time of Sargon (B.C. 722-705), was applied to the whole territory between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean. (See HITTITES.) The most important ancient cities on or near the Euphrates were Charchemish (2 Chron. xxxiv. 20), later Hirnapolis, now Jerablus, not far from one of the main crossings of the river, and, lower down, Sippa, Agade, Babylon, Borsippa, Ereach (Warke), Larsa and Ur (Mugheir).

For the ancient Babylonians the river was indispensable, not only as giving them water-communication with the sea, but as offering them means of irrigation by opening canals through the land: the result was a fertility abundantly evidenced in classic writers (e.g., Herodotus, i. 193; Xen., Anab. ii. 3, §§ 14-16; Strabo, xvii. 1, § 14), which, by proper engineering, might be restored.

The union of the Euphrates and Tigris in the Saṭṭ el-Abar is of comparatively modern date. The encroachment of the land on the water of the Persian Gulf is said by Lord Loftus (Chaldais and Susiana, p. 282) to have been going on at the rate of a mile in seventy years since the beginning of the Christian era. It is believed that the rate was once larger, so that in the earliest historic times the sea may have extended a hundred and fifty or two hundred miles farther to the north-west than at present. This great physical change is confirmed by the statement of Piny (Nat. Hist. VI. § 31) and by the cuneiform inscriptions. These (Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia, III. 12 s.) represent Sennacherib (B.C. 705-681) as sailing down the Euphrates to its mouth, and then, after solemn sacrifices, as before, a dangerous voyage, embarking his army in Phoenician ships, and crossing the sea to the mouth of the Euleus, the River of Elam: this is now the Karun, and empties into one of the arms of the Saṭṭ el-Abar. An inscription of Sargon (Cun. Inscri. West. Asia, III. 11, 22-23) speaks also of the city Dilman, situated "three hundred and twenty miles, which may be an exaggeration) in the sea. The island or peninsula where this city stood now has become a part of the mainland.


EUSEBIUS, a Greek by birth, the son of a physician, succeeded Marcellus as Bishop of Rome in 310. There raged at that moment a bitter controversy in Rome concerning the treatment of the lapsi. Eusebius insisted on penance, but caused thereby great tumults, which caused Maxentius to banish the leaders of both parties. Eusebius died in Sicily, after a reign of four, or, according to other authorities, of seven months. He is honored in the Roman calendar as a saint Sept. 26 is his day.
EUSEBIUS OF ALEXANDRIA is the author of a number of homilies (twenty-one) which enjoyed great reputation in the Eastern Church during the sixth and seventh centuries. Nothing is known with certainty of his life. In the manuscripts of his works he is described as a monk and high dignitary of the church,—bishop, archbishop, patriarch, papa: in an old biography of him, printed by Cardinal Mai, in Spicileg. Rom., IX. p. 703, he is designated as Bishop of Alexandria after Cyril. But we have the list of Alexandrian bishops; and there is nowhere room for an Eusebius, least of all immediately after Cyril. Some of the homilies, which, however, are of no great interest, are found in Gallandi, Bibl. Patrum, VIII. p. 252. See Thilo, Uber d. Schriften d. E. v. A., Halle, 1832, Semisch.

EUSEBIUS, surnamed Bruno, Bishop of Angers from 1047 to his death (1081), was, at least for some time, an adherent and defender of Berengarius of Tours. In a letter dating from 1049 he bitterly complains of the manner in which the Pope, in support of Berengarius, had reckoned him one of his patrons (Csn. Socr., ed. Wischer, p. 52): so did others. Bishop Theotwin of Liége expressly charges him with having renewed the old heresy concerning the Lord's Supper, that it contained only a semblance or shadow of Christ's body (Gallandi, Bibl. Patrum, XIV. p. 244). Nevertheless, after the death of Count Gaufried of Anjou (1060), the valiant champion of the cause of Berengarius, he seems to have lost his courage. At the conference of Angers (1062) he assumed a very cool attitude towards Berengarius; and in the same mood is the famous letter written (somewhere between 1063 and 1066), in which he declines to act as arbitrator in a dispute between Berengarius and Gaufried Martini. Lessing has called this letter one of the most excellent theological productions of the eleventh century; but this is simply a mistake. The letter is nothing but a cunningly devised cover for a cowardly retreat. The letters of Eusebius are found in an authentic text in Mai's ed. of Monumenta Augusti, ins. vol. opus imperf. 32 priores, p. 499. The texts given by Du Roye and Du Bouley are mutilated. Two new letters were given by Sündendorf, Bereng. Turonensis, 1856, Semisch.

EUSEBIUS, Bishop of Cesarea (surnamed Pamphili, "the friend of Pamphilus"), was b. in the latter part of the third century, between 260 and 270, probably in Palestine; d. at Cesarea, 340. One of his earliest teachers was Bishop Meletius of Pontus, who, during the persecution of Diocletian, sought refuge in Palestine. Afterwards he studied at Antioch, under the presbyter Dorotheus. But the two great decisive influences in his education were the writings of Origen, and the intimate intercourse, at Cesarea, with Pamphilus, under whose guidance he made his first steps as a writer. When he was forced to leave Cesarea on account of the persecution, during which Pamphilus suffered martyrdom, he fled to Tyre, and thence to Egypt. After his return he was made Bishop of Cesarea (318). The principal problem which presented itself for solution during his episcopate was the Arian controversy, opened in 318. His own standpoint was one intermediate between Arius and Athanasius, based on Origen; but he had neither dialectical power to justify, nor force of character to maintain it. At the Council of Nicaea (325) he tried to effect a reconciliation between the two contending parties, but failed. After fighting against the idea of homousios to the last, he finally yielded, and signed the orthodox confession. But he retained in his heart a feeling of rancor against Athanasius, and he was ever afterwards one of the leaders of the Arians. He presided at the synod of Tyre (335), convened for the purpose of deposing Athanasius. But the attempt at reconciliation he made at Nicaea procured him the friendship of the emperor. He enjoyed the confidence of Constantine in a particular degree; though it may be, that, in many cases, this confidence was addressed to the author, rather than to the person. In his relation to Constantine, however, he showed the same weakness of character as in his relation to Athanasius. As he was unable to see the truth when it concerned Athanasius, he was unable to speak the truth when it concerned Constantine.

It is as an author, however, rather than as a bishop, that Eusebius attained his great fame. His writings are historical, apologetic, theological, and exegetical. The most important of them are those on history; and his Πατριαρχικαί ἴστορια, in ten books, giving the history of the Christian Church from its origin to 324, has naturally procured for him the title of "Father of Church History;" not because he was a master of the historiographer's art,—for he has neither method with respect to the whole, nor criticism with respect to details; neither style nor absolute veracity,—but because he was the first in the field; because he was possessed of materials which would soon have been lost if he had not utilized them; and because he availed himself of these advantages with indefatigable industry and energy. As a repertory of facts and documents, his work is invaluable. The principal editions are by Valesius (Du Valois), with Latin translation Paris, 1639, re-edited by Reading, Canterbury, 1720; by Heinichen, Leipzig, 1827, 2d ed., 1898, 3 vols.; Burton, Oxford, 1838; Schwegler (pocket edition), Tübingen, 1852; Dindorf, Leipzig, 1871. [Into English the book has been translated by Hamner, 1854, and, better, by C. F. Crusé, N.Y., 1865.] Special investigations into the trustworthiness of the book have been made by Müller, Copenhagen, 1813; Danz, Jena, 1815; Keßler, Göttingen, 1816; Reuterdahl, Lund, 1820; Rienstra, Trèves, 1833. Before he wrote his Ecclesiastical History, and as a preparation for it, Eusebius compiled his Chronicle, of which the first part gives an outline of the history of the world to 325, and the second an extract of this outline, arranged in tabular form. Of the original Greek text, only fragments have come down to us. Of the second part, Jerome gave a free translation into Latin. Collections of all fragments (Greek, Latin, and Armenian) of the Chronicle have been made by Mai (Script. Vet. Nov. Coll., 1833, VIII.), and among the other historical works of Eusebius are: a Life of Constantine, written after 337, edited by Heinichen, Leipzig, 1830, 2d ed., 1899.
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EUSEBIUS OF NICOMEDIA was first Bishop of Berytus in Phoenicia, then of Nicomedia, where the imperial court resided, and finally of Constantinople, where he died 342.

EUSEBIUS, Bishop of Laodicea, in Syria, d. 269; was b. in Alexandria, and gave, while deacon, of the church in his native city, the most striking proofs of Christian love, and fearless constancy of faith, both during the persecution of Valerian (257) and during the plague (263).

EUSEBIUS, Bishop of Doryleum in Phrygia; and by his persistence he succeeded in getting Eutyches condemned and deposed. By the synod of Ephesus, however (449), he was himself deposed, and fled to Rome; but by the Council of Chalcedon (451) he was re-instated, and died in his see.

Some minor polemical writings of his — Libellus ad Eutychem, Libellus ad Eutychen, etc.—have come down to us, and are found in LABRE, Conc. Coll., IV.

EUSEBIUS, Bishop of Emesa, d. about 360; was b. of a distinguished family in Edessa, Mesopotamia; studied under Eusebius of Caesarea, and Patrophilus of Scythopolis, also in Antioch after 330 (with the method and spirit of whose school he became thoroughly imbued, and finally in Alexandria. His fame as an exegete and preacher was so great, that in 341 the synod of Antioch designated him as a fit successor to the deposed Athanasius; but he knew too well how ardently the Alexandrian congregation adhered to its bishop, and he declined. He was then appointed Bishop of Emesa, in Phoenicia; but there, too, he encountered great opposition. The inhabitants feared his astronomical knowledge, and rose against him as a magician. He fled to Laodicea, and settled afterwards in Antioch, where he spent the rest of his life. Of his numerous writings (Jerome mentions polemical works against the Jews, Pagans, and Manichæans; Ebed Jesus, a work on the Old Testament, etc.), nothing but fragments have come down to us. The homilies edited by Gagné, (1547) and by Fromy (1595) are spurious; but the first two homilies against Marcellus, ascribed to Eusebius of Caesarea, and found among his works (Opuscula 14, ed. Sirmondi, 1646), belong probably to Eusebius of Emesa. His Life, written by Bishop George of Laodicea, is also lost. See AUGUSTI: Eua. Emes. Opuscula, Elberfeld, 1829; THIL: Eua. of Alex. and Eua. von Emes., Halle, 1832.
of Lucian of Antioch, and it is probable that he held the same views as Arius from the very beginning. He afterwards modified his ideas somewhat, or perhaps he only yielded to the pressure of circumstances; but he was, if not the teacher, at all events the leader and organizer, of the Arian party. At the Council of Nicaea (325) he took the Confession, but only after a long and desperate opposition. His defence of Arius excited the wrath of the emperor, and a few months after the council he was sent into exile. After the lapse of three years, he succeeded in regaining the imperial favor; and after his return (in 329) he brought the whole machinery of the state government into action in order to impose his views upon the church. In 331 a synod of Antioch condemned and deposed Eustathius, one of the pillars of the orthodox party. In 336 Athanasius was banished to Treves, and in 337 Arius was invited to Constantinople to be solemnly received again into the ranks of the Catholic Church. The Arian party was victorious, and ready to take possession of the church; and the victory was due chiefly to Eusebius. See, for further information, literature, etc., the article on ARIANISM.

EUSEBIUS, Bishop of Samosota, on the Euphrates, since 361, d. about 379; was one of the chief pillars of the orthodox church during its contest with Arianism in the latter part of the fourth century. During the reign of Valens he travelled through the dioceses of Syria, Phoenicia, and Palestine, in the disguise of a soldier, exhorting the faithful, and consecrating orthodox priests; and the election of Basil to the see of Cesarea, in Cappadocia, was chiefly due to his exertions (370). In 373 he was banished to Thrace, and lived in exile to the death of Valens, 378. Shortly after his return, while engaged in the re-organization of the Syrian Church, he was killed at Dolica (a small town in the district of Comagene) by a stone thrown at him by an Arian woman. See, besides Theodoret (Hist. Eccl., 2, 28; 4, 12, etc.), the Letters of Basil (Ep. 5–9, 253–265; Opp., ed. Paris, 1638, II.), and Gregory Nazianzen (Ep. 28–30. p. 342. Paris, 1832). EUSEBIUS, Archbishop of Thessalonica, flourished about 600; wrote ten books against the Aphthartodocetes (a branch of the Monophysites), which have been lost, but of which Photius gives the list of contents (Bibl. Cod., 162); and was by Gregory the Great encouraged to employ still more vigorous measures against heretics (Ep. 10, 42; 11, 74).

EUSEBIUS, Bishop of Vercelli, in Piedmont, d. about 371; was b. in the island of Sardinia, and educated in Rome by Pope Eusebius. Elected Bishop of Vercelli by an unanimous vote of the people and the clergy, he became one of the principal champions of the orthodox church in its contest with Arianism during the reign of Constantius. The synod of Milan was convened in 355. The orthodox party hoped to procure a vindication and restitution of Athanasius. The Arians tried to get the condemnation of Arles reversed, and, convinced of their own weakness, the emperor finally employed force, and the Arians gained the ascendency; but Eusebius did not yield. He was banished, first to Scythopolis, afterwards to Cappadocia, and finally to the Thebaid; and in the latter places he was kept in close confinement. After the death of Constantius he regained his liberty; but the contest with Arianism still continued, and he was finally stoned to death, according to the legend, by his adversaries. His Letters are found in Gallandi, Bibli. Partr., V. p. 78, etc. For his life, see Jerome, Vires Illustres. c. xvi. Migne's ed., T. 28, p. 987; Act. Sanct., Aug., I. p. 940; and Ughelli, in Italia Sacra, Tom. XIV. p. 747.

EUSTACHIUS, or, as the Greeks call him, EUSTATHIUS, is one of the most celebrated saints of the Roman-Catholic Church, though his life lies wholly in the field of romance. According to his acts, written in Greek, and dating from the eighth century, he was an officer of some repute in the army of Trajan. His name was Placidus. By a miraculous apparition of Christ he was converted; and, after many wonderful vicissitudes, he was roasted to death in Rome, together with his whole family. The remains, however, of Antioch, arose in defence of their bishop, though in vain: they only succeeded in provoking the emperor, and Eustathius was banished to Thrace. Of his numerous writings, only a work against Origen is still extant: Bibl. Max. Patr., XVII.

EUSTATHIUS OF ANTIOCH, b. at Side, Pamphylia; d. at Philippi 387; was first Bishop of Berytus (Syria), and then of Antioch. In the Council of Nicaea he vehemently opposed the Arians; but they took revenge when they got into power, and deposed him in 331. The inhabitants, however, of Antioch, arose in defence of their bishop, though in vain: they only succeeded in provoking the emperor, and Eustathius was banished to Thrace. Of his numerous writings, only a work against Origen is still extant: Bibl. Max. Patr., XVII.

EUSTATHIUS OF SEBASTE (Armenia) from 350; a native of Cappadocia; d. 380; changed several times from orthodoxy to Arianism, and from Arianism to Semi-Arianism, and back again, and joined finally the Eunomians, but was condemned by several synods, and lost at last the confidence of all parties. He built a hospital for sick people and travellers in Sebaste, and introduced monasticism in Armenia, Pontus, and Paphlagonia, which gave rise to the formation of an enthusiastic ascetic party, the Eustathians. They were condemned by the synod of Gangra, and disappeared speedily. See Socrates: H. E., II. 48; Sozomen: H. E., III. 14.

EUSTATHIUS OF THESSALONICA, b. in Constantinople in the first half of the twelfth century; metropolitan of Thessalonica since 1175; d. there in 1194; has long been famous for his commentaries on the Greek classics, especially Homer. But the publication of his theological works by Tafel (Opuscula, Francfort, 1832, and De Thessalonica, Berlin, 1839) shows, furthermore, that he was a man of true Christian spirit, with a sharp eye for the moral and religious deprivation of his time, and with something of the talent and character of a reformer. His Thesaphpia, the Monastic Life (μοναχική ζωή) was translated into German, Betrachtungen über d. Mönchstand, by Tafel, Berlin, 1847.
Rome about 370; made while young a vow of perpetual virginity, which caused Jerome to write his *De Virginitate*, and devoted herself to an ascetic life. Together with her mother, she accompanied Jerome to Palestine (385); and, after the death of Paula, she became superior of the convent in Bethlehem, where she died 418. In the Roman Church she is considered a saint. Her day of celebration is Sept. 28.

**EUTHALIUS.** A deacon of the Alexandrian Church, and afterwards Bishop of Sulca; flourished in the middle of the fifth century, and introduced in the Acts, the Epistles of Paul, and the Catholic Epistles, the same division into chapters and verses which had already been introduced in the Gospels by Ammonius of Alexandria in the middle of the third century. See *Bible Text*, p. 296.

**EUTHYMIUS ZIGADENUS, or ZIQUABENUS,** one of the most prominent Byzantine theologians of the twelfth century, and a characteristic representative of the whole school. Of his life very little is known. He was monk in a monastery near Constantinople, enjoyed the favor of the Emperor Alexius Comnenus, is spoken of with praise by Anna Comnena, and died after 1118. Of his exegetical works his commentary on the Psalms was published in a Latin version by Philip Saul, Verona, 1530, and afterwards often. The Greek text of the preface and introduction was printed by Le Moyne, *Varia Sacra*, Lyons, 1685, I. pp. 150—210. The whole work, Greek and Latin, is found in *Opera Omnia Theophylacti*, Venice, 1754—63, T. IV. Another and still more important work, a commentary to the four Gospels, was likewise first printed in a Latin version by J. Hen-tenius, Louvain, 1544: the Greek text was not published until 1792, by C. P. Matthäi, at Leipzig. His great dogmatical work, *Pantokrator*, a refutation of twenty-four different heresies, was written at the instance of the Emperor Alexius. In the Latin version by P. F. Zini of Venice, 1555 the twelfth and thirteenth chapters against the Pope and Paul, and the Catholic Epistles, the same division into chapters and verses which had already been introduced in the Gospels by Ammonius of Alexandria in the middle of the third century. See *Bible Text*, p. 296.

**EUTYCHES and EUTYCHIANISM.** Eutyches finally caused it to burst forth. He was at that time about seventy years old, and had lived for more than thirty years as superior of a monastery in the neighborhood of Constantinople. A severe ascetic, he seldom left the monastery; but in his cell he used to converse with his visitors in an astounding manner about the mystery, and he was uneducated; unpractised in reasoning, and yet delighting in debate. He hated the Antiochian theology; and all his life through he was zealous in hunting down heretics. At the synod of Ephesus (431) he was one of Cyril's most devoted partisans; and no doubt he was one of the leaders of that procession of psalmizing monks which penetrated into the imperial palace, and compelled Theodosius II. to confirm the party-manoeuvres of the synod as ecumenical decisions. At present he was in great favor at the court, especially with the imperial minister of state, Chrysaphius; and, playing with equal force the saint in the halls of the palace and the oracle in the cell of the monastery, he was deeply engaged in counteracting the Antiochians. In the spring of 448 he wrote to Pope Leo I. (Leo. Ep., 20, in Mans, V. p. 1828), to the effect that the Nestorian heresy was still living in the Eastern Church. Indeed, when at this time Domnus, Patriarch of Antioch, appeared before the emperor, and accused Eutyches of heresy, it was simply an act of self-defence from the Antiochian side.

The move of Domnus had no effect; but in the fall of the same year (448) Bishop Eusebius of Doryleum laid before the synod of Constantinople a formal accusation of Eutyches, as holding and teaching blasphemous views of the person of Christ. Flavian, who was a moderate Antiochian, and that he had a bitter enemy in Dioscorus, Cyril's successor in Alexandria, wanted to have the whole matter smoothed down by means of a personal conference between Eutyches and Eusebius; but the latter pushed his case with so much vigor, that Eutyches was actually summited before the synod. After many delays he appeared, accompanied by a division of the imperial guard, and swarms of excited monks. He was examined, and he answered half defiantly, half evasively. Nevertheless, he acknowledged that he considered the body of Christ to have been of quite another substance than other human bodies, and that was of course enough to prove
Eutyches, however, Dioscorus, Chrysophius, and the whole party whose interests were at stake, did not feel willing to acquiesce in the decision. Their first move was to demand a revision of the acts of the synod. It was granted, but no irregularity was discovered. They then began to clamor for a new ecumenical council. Flavian and Leo I. tried to prevent such a measure; but when Leo I. dated his famous letter (Leo. Ep., 28, in Mansi, V. p. 1306), by which he hoped to place himself as arbiter between the two contending parties (June 18, 449), the invitation to the new council had already been sent out (March 20, 449). It opened at Ephesus (Aug. 8, 449), under the presidency of Dioscorus, a shameless and violent character; it proceeded amid the howlings and tumult of drunken soldiers and fanatical monks; and it bears in history, for good reasons, the name of the "Robber Synod." Eutyches was re-instanted, and Eusebius was even not allowed to speak. Flavian was condemned; and when some bishops attempted to embrace the feet of the president, and move him to pity, he cried out for the soldiers; and in broke the rabble with unspeakable confusion. Flavian was trampled upon, and beaten almost to death. Eusebius fled; also the papal legato escaped. Domnus of Antioch, Theodoret, and other prominent members of the Antiochian school, were deposed; and by means of falsified acts the sanction of the emperor was obtained. The triumph of the Alexandrian party was complete; but it did not prove lasting.

The sudden death of Theodosius II. (450) produced a change in the affairs. The new rulers, Pulcheria and her husband Marcian, were orthodox. The bishops who had been banished by the instrumentality of Dioscorus were recalled; and the remains of Flavian were brought to Constantinople, and entombed in the Church of the Apostles; Eutyches was once more excommunicated, and banished from the metropolis. It was the wish of the new government to give the country peace; and nothing seemed better suited to stop all controversies, and appease the reigning feeling of excitement, than a fourth ecumenical synod. It was convened at Chalcedon, and opened Oct. 8, 451. Dioscorus was unaniomously condemned; not on account of heresy, however, but on account of the frightful accusations of fraud, violence, and crimes of almost every description, which were raised against him by his own congregation. More difficulty was experienced in elaborating a set of christological formulas, which should exclude all heresies, and gather the whole church together. The problem was solved, however, by taking as the basis of Leo's famous letter of Feb. 7, 452, made this confession obligatory. The measures which were employed against the Eutychians were rather harsh. Nevertheless, remnants of the party, having monasteries of their own, and celebrating service in a somewhat peculiar manner, lived on for a long time. See the article CHRIStOLOGY.


Eutychianus, Bishop of Rome (from January, 275, to December, 283), is honored in the Roman-Catholic Church as a saint and martyr. His day falls on Dec. 1. There is, however, no proof of his martyrdom but a report found in some later recensions of the Liber Pontificalis. The earlier recensions, as well as all other sources, are silent on the subject. Some decretales ascribed to him, but spurious, are found in Migne, Patr. Lat., V.

Eutychius, Patriarch of Alexandria, b. 576, at Fostat, the present Cairo; d. May 12, 640; was originally a physician; studied afterwards history and theology; entered the church, and was made patriarch in 932. As such he suffered very severe attacks from the Jacobite Copts, he himself being the leader of the orthodox or Melchite party. He was a prolific writer, and wrote in Arabic; but most of his writings have perished. His principal work, however (a world's history from the creation to 937, and of no small interest for the history of the Eastern Church), is still extant, and was edited in Arabic, with a Latin translation by E. Pococke, Oxford, 1658, 1659.

Eutychius, Patriarch of Constantinople, b. about 510; d. 582; was a monk and catholicos in the city of Amasia, in Pontus; came in 551 as delegate from his bishop, and gained the favor of the Emperor Justinian by proving from Scripture that it was right to lay the ban of the church upon men, even though they had died long ago; was in the same year made patriarch of Constantinople; played a prominent part in the "Three Chapters" controversy, and presided at the ecumenical synod of 553, but lost the favor of the emperor by refusing to acknowledge the doctrine of the monophysite Apithartodocetes as orthodox; was deposed, and banished to Amasia 585. After twelve years of banishment he was reinstated in his see by Justin II.; and by the church he was honored with the dignity of a saint on account of his sufferings for the cause of orthodoxy. His Life, written by an intimate servant of his, is found in Act. Sanct., April, I. p. 550. Of his writings three fragments on the Lord's Supper have been published by Mai; Class. Auct., X. 493, and Script. Vet. Nov. Col., IX. 623. A letter from him to Pope Vigilius, dated 563, is found in Mansi, X. 186.

EvaGrius Ponticus was b. at Iberia, on the Black Sea; studied under Basilius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory Nazianzen, who brought him to Constantinople in 379, and with whom he went to Jerusalem in 385. He afterwards retired into the Nitrian Desert, and lived a hermit among the hermits. The year of his death is unknown. From contemporary documents it is evident that he enjoyed a considerable reputation; and the reason why the after-time treated him so coolly may simply be, that, in the Origenite controversy, he took the side of Origen. What has come down
EVANGELICAL UNION. In 1841 James Morison, minister of the United Secession Church at Kilmarnock, Scotland, was depowered for holding anti-Calvinistic views upon faith, the work of the Spirit in salvation, and upon the extent of the atonement. Faith was declared to be one's belief that Christ died for him; the Spirit is "poured out upon all flesh," and strives with all the unregenerated, and dwells in all believers, while the atonement was universal. Mr. Morison's father, who was a minister, and two other ministers who held these views, met at Kilmarnock, and formed the Evangelical Union. The movement spread, and now the union embraces about ninety churches. The association is independent of government, and also in doctrines resemble in general the Congregational churches of Scotland and the Cumberland Presbyterian Church of the United States. Mr. Morison is the author of very valuable commentaries upon the Third Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans (Lond. 1868), Matthew (1870), and Mark (1872, 3d ed., 1881). See Evangelical Union Annual, and F. Ferguson, History of the Evangelical Union, Glasgow, 1876.

EVANGELIST (εὐαγγελίστης, "a herald of glad tidings") is from the same root as the words translated "gospel" (εὐαγγελίζω) and to "preach the word" (εὐαγγέλισαμαι). In Eph. iv. 11 the evangelists are enumerated side by side with apostles, prophets, pastors, and teachers, and follow prophets. This special mention leads us to attribute to them a distinct form of activity. It did not consist in the execution of apostolic functions, the exercise of prophetic gifts, the oversight of churches, or diaconal service, but in preaching, and testifying to the facts of Christ's life. But the evangelists are not to be regarded as a distinct order of church officials. Deacons, presbyters, and apostles (Acts viii. 25; 1 Cor. i. 17, etc.) all might exercise evangelistic functions. Timothy, the bishop-presbyter, was exhorted to "do the work of an evangelist" (2 Tim. iv. 5); and Philip, one of the seven deacons at Jerusalem, is called an evangelist (Acts viii. 5, xxx. 6). The evangelist is one who is set apart for the purpose of travelling from place to place. This was the case with Philip, who preached in Samaria, expanded the word to the eunuch on his way to Gaza, and then labored in Cæsarea and the cities round about (Acts viii. 40). They acted independently (Acts viii. 4), but largely as "fellow-laborers" and assistants of the apostles, accompanying them on their journeys, and laboring under their direction. Theodoret was the first to restrict the term to itinerant preachers (περιπολούμενοι κηρυκτοί); and Ecumenius applied it for the first time strictly to the authors of the Gospels. The term is used at the present time in both these senses.

LIT. — Neander and Schaff: Histories of the Apos't Church; Smith's Dict. of Bible, article by Dr. Pliemptre. 

EVANGELISTARY (Evangelistarium), the name of the church-book which contains the portions
of the Gospels to be read in the Liturgy. If the book contained all the four Gospels, it was called Evangelistarium plenarium.

Evangelium Aeternum was a supposed book, rather than a real book, based upon the writings of Joachim of Floris, and referring to certain ideas entertained by one party of the Franciscans concerning the reforming and re-organizing mission of their order. Gerhardus, a Franciscan monk belonging to the above party, compiled in the middle of the thirteenth century, from the writings of Joachim of Floris (d. 1292), a book, which he called Introductorium in Evangelium Aeternum, and in which he applied to his order Joachim's vague prophecies of a third stage in the history of mankind,—the era of the Holy Spirit. From the title of this book arose the rumor of a new gospel, the Everlasting Gospel, in the possession of the Franciscans. The book itself has perished; but it is partially known to us from a fragment of a work by Hugo of Caro (d. 1262), Processus in Evangelium Aeternum, confirmed by Quétif and Echard, in Script. Predict., I. 202-213. See Joachim of Floris.

Evans, Christmas, an eloquent Baptist preacher of Wales; b. at Esgaiswen on Christmas Day, 1766; d. July 14, 1838. He was the son of a shoemaker, and after his father's death was forced to work at servile employments for a living. At the age of seventeen he was converted, and for the first time learned to read. At this period he lost an eye in an act of self-defence. He was ordained 1790, and, after a pastorate of two years at Lleyn, went to the Isle of Anglesea, where his salary for many years was only seventeen pounds. In 1796 he removed to Tonypandy, and in 1803 to Caernarvon. Evans was a man of ardent piety, and great power as a preacher. The fragments that remain of his sermons show him a master in parabolic comparison and dramatic representation. These characteristics have won for him the title of the "Welsh Bunyan." When Robert Hall was reminded that Evans had only one eye, he replied, "Yes, sir; but that eye could lead an army through a wilderness at midnight." In recent times Evans' career has acted as a powerful stimulus upon Mr. Moody.

LIT. HUNSTEIN: Life of Christmas Evans, Lond., 1847; JAMES CROSS: Sermons of C. Evans, with Memoir, Phila., 1854; E. PAXTON HOOD: Christmas Evans, Lond., 1881.

Evans, John, D.D., a nonconformist divine; b. at Wrexham, Denbighshire, 1680; d. in London, May 16, 1730. He succeeded Dr. Daniel Williams in London. He completed Matthew Henry's commentary on Romans, and gathered much of the material subsequently used by Mr. Neal in his history of the Puritans. His best-known work is his Discourses concerning the Christian Temper; being Thirty-eight Sermons upon the Principal Heads of Practical Religion, Lond., 4th ed., 1757, 2 vols., etc., with a Life, by Dr. John Erskine, Lond., 1825.

Evans, John, LL.D., a Baptist minister; b. at Usk, Monmouthshire, 1707; d. in London, 1827; wrote A Sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World, with a Persuasive to Religious Moderation, London, 1794; 13th ed., revised by the author, 1827; 18th ed., 1841, trans. into Welsh and Continental languages, reprinted in several editions in United States. Upwards of a hundred thousand copies were sold during the author's lifetime; but for the copyright he received only ten pounds.

Evanson, Edward, a minister of the Church of England; b. at Warrington, Lancashire, April 21, 1731; d. at Colford, Gloucestershire, Sept. 25, 1805. He took his M.A. at Cambridge, 1758. In 1773 he was tried in the Consistorial Court of Gloucester for publicly altering or omitting such phrases in the church-service as seemed to him to be untrue, correcting the authorized version of the Scriptures, and for conversing against the Creeds and the divinity of Christ. The case was carried on appeal to the Court of Arches, and finally quashed, on technical grounds, in 1777. He gave the widest currency he could to his heretical views in his Dissonance of the Four generally received Evangelists, and the Evidence of their Respective Authenticity examined, with that of other Scriptures deemed Canonical (Gloucester, 1792), in which he rejected the greater part of the New Testament as a forgery, and accepted the Gospel of Luke alone of the four. To this book Thomas Falconer replied in the Bampton Lecture for 1810, Certain Principles in Evanson's Dissonance of the Four generally received Evangelists, etc., examined. Evanson's views upon the sabbath brought him into controversy with Dr. Priestley.

Eve (אֵվ, "life"); so LXX, in Gen. iii., translates by Zoh "life;" elsewhere, however, Eta), "the mother of all living." According to Gen. ii. 20, God would give man a "help meet for him;" literally, a help as before him; i.e., corresponding to him, his fellow in body and spirit. The simple, straightforward Bible narrative of Eve's creation and reception is given in Gen. ii. 21-25. Different interpretations have found defenders and expositors.

1. The Literal.—While Adam slept, God took one of his ribs, and fashioned out of it a woman. God, says Adam, recognized the identity of substance and unity of life, and called the new creation הַנְנ (Ishha, "female man"), because she was taken out of אֵו (Ish, "man"). The name הַנְנ was not given until after the fall, and was not an appellative, but her proper name, having not only a natural, but an historical significance, connected with the history of redemption; for it indicated Adam's faith that new life and salvation would issue from the womb of Eve. How long the first pair lived in Eden is unknown. By eating the forbidden fruit, under the temptation of Satan, they fell. Outside of the garden, Eve bore her first-born, and called him Cain ("possession"), apparently under the impression that she had borne the promised deliverer. Her second son she named Abel ("vanity"), indicating her disappointment: the third son she called Seth ("compensation"), because God had appointed her a seed, instead of dead Abel. With this remark the history of Eve closes.

2. The Allegorical.—The allegorists find their Coryphaeus in Philo, who, having declared (in the second book of his Allegories of the Sacred Laws, after the Work of the Six Days of Creation, II. § vii.) the literal statement (that Eve was made from Adam's rib) to be fabulous, proceeds to explain that by the story is meant the creation of the external sense immediately after the creation.
of the mind. This took place when the mind was asleep. By 'rib' he understands "one of the many powers of the mind; namely, that power which dwells in the outward senses." This mode of interpretation was followed by the Alexandrian school among the fathers, who, however, granted the historicity of the story. To them Eve represented the sensuous or perceptive part of man, and Adam the rational. The Latin fathers do not go quite this length, although willing to allow that a spiritual sense underlay the literal, and to find in the formation of Eve from the side of Adam a type of the formation of the Church from the Saviour's side. Later on, among the schoolmen, Thomas Aquinas speaks of Eve as a woman after that of man they allow; but as for the story—it is a charming id 1. The Bible opens with a poem. Adam an Eve doubtless were no beings corresponding to the biblical Adam and Eve. A very tall account of the mind was made of a rib out of the side of Adam; not made out of his head, to top him; not out of his feet, to be trampled upon by him; but out of his side, to be equal with him; from under his arm, to be protected; and from near his heart, to be beloved;" for he says, responding to arguments against the formation of woman from the rib of man, "Primo quidem ad significandum quod inter virum et mulierem debet esse specialis conjunctio; neque enim mulier debet dominari in virum; et ieco non est formata de capite; neque debet a viro desperi, tanquam serviliter subjecta; et ieco non est formata de pedibus." 1

3. The Mythical. — Adam, Eve, the whole story of the early life of the race, in short, is a mist spread over the face of creation. There were no beings corresponding to the biblical pair: the story is mere dramatic personation of ideas, — sexual contrast, sexual love, the beginning of existence.

4. The Poetical. — The advocates of this interpretation believe in all the results stated in Genesis, but not in the processes. The creation of woman after that of man they allow; but as for the story—it is a charming idyl. The Bible opens with a poem. Adam and Eve doubtless existed, but one cannot vouch for the actions attributed to them.

It remains to glance at the legends which are actually told about Adam and Eve. A very widely circulated opinion is, that man and woman were originally joined in one body, and that God separated them, the rabbins say by a hatchet. They say further, that, "When Eve had to be drawn out of the side of Adam, she was not extracted by the head, lest she should be vain; nor by the eyes, lest she should be wanton; nor by the mouth, lest she should be given to gossiping; nor by the ears, lest she should get too worldly. Thenceforward, not by the feet, lest she should be meddlesome; nor by the feet, lest she should be a gadabout; nor by the heart, lest she should be jealous; but she was drawn forth by the side: yet, notwithstanding all these precautions, she has every fault specially guarded against. It was a rabbinical fancy that Eve was Adam's second wife, the first being Lilith. In this way the double account of woman's creation (Gen. i. 27 and ii. 18) was accounted for. Lilith was formed of clay at the same time with Adam, but expelled for pride and bad conduct. She subsequently married the Devil, and was the ancestress of the Jins,—creatures endowed with human and devilish qualities. According to the Targum of Jonathan, Eve was made from Adam's thirteenth rib. Much curious information is found in FABRI CCIUS: Codex Pseudep. V.T.; BARTOLOCCI: Bibliotheca Rabbinica; EISENMENGER: EnedictekJudenhum; WAGENSEIL: Sota; and recently W. MEYER: Vita Adae et Eva, Munchen, 1876, a scholarly edition of a composition which Meyer attributes to a pre-Christian Jewish source; but the most accessible volume is S. BARING-GOULD: Legends of the Patriarchs and Prophets, N.Y., 1872; cf. W. ROBERTSON SMITH's art. Eve, in Encycl. Brit., 9th ed. SAMUEL M. JACKSON.

EVELYN, John, b. at Wotton, Surrey, Oct. 31, 1620; d. there Feb. 27, 1706. He is best known by his Sylva, London, 1664, an elaborate work upon arbiculture (the first book published by the Royal Society), and by his Diary from 1641 to 1706 (best edition by William Bray, with Life by Henry B. Wheatley, London, 1874, 4 vols.), a treasury of information in regard to the private life of his century. He is mentioned here because he formed the world's first popular romance, or "count of the True Religion" (first published from his manuscript by Rev. R. M. EVANSON, London, 1850, 2 vols.), a valuable epitome of arguments against the infidelity of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Evelyn preserved an untarnished reputation at a time when men of his high social position were commonly lax in morals.

EVERLASTING GOSPEL. See Evangelium Eternum.

EVE. See Vigils.

EVIDENCES, Christian. See APOLOGISTICS. E\'VILMEROD\'DACH (Heb. ???? ???; LXX. ?????????, ?????????, and variants; Babyl. ????-? ???-, late pronunciation mid-

E\'VILMEROD\'DACH, man of the god Merodach) was the son and successor of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, and reigned, according to Ptolemy's canon (list of Babylonian kings), B.C. 561-580. The only scriptural mention of him is in 2 Kings xxiv. 27-30, where it is said that, in the year of his accession, he released from prison, after a captivity of thirty-seven years, Jehoiachin, king of Judah, that he changed his prison-garments, set his seat above the seat of the
Babylonian vassal-kings or princes, gave him a daily allowance, and made him his constant table companion. Notwithstanding this, Josephus (c. Ap. I. 11, 2), that he reigned eighteen years, is as little worthy of credence as the twelve years assigned to him by Alexander Polyhistor (Euseb., Chron., I. 6), or his regency of seven years, of which Jerome speaks (on Isa. xiv. 19). Contemporary records exist in the form of eleven contract tablets, inscribed in the cuneiform character, and dated in his reign, three from the year of his accession (B.C. 563), four from his first year, and four from his second year (W. St. C. Boscawen, in Trans. Soc. Bib. Arch., VI. p. 52). FRANCIS BROWN.

EVOLUTION and DEVELOPMENT. These phrases, so much used in the present day, have much the same meaning. Both point to one process viewed under two different aspects. Both indicate that one thing comes out of another. But development denotes the process going on; whereas evolution refers more to the process as we look back upon it. We talk of the seed being developed into the plant, and of the plant being evolved from the seed. Development or evolution is a method of procedure adopted by God, both in the kingdom of nature and the kingdom of grace.

I. There is undoubtedly development in nature. It is wrong in religious people to deny it. Everybody acts upon it. We all regard events as coming out of antecedent circumstances, commonly out of a concurrence, or train of occurrences. The process is seen more particularly in organic nature, in which there is a double development,—the seed from the plant, and the plant from the seed; the child from the parent, and, it may be, growing into the parent. Generally, in God's works, the present is the fruit of the past and the seed of the future. This was noticed from the beginning of observation. But of late years it has been scientifically examined, and the process is shown to be extensively employed, in a sense to be universal. For several ages it has been acknowledged that there is universal causation; not merely the grand first and abiding Cause, but second causes. It is God who produces the spring; but he does so by agents, like the sun, the seed, and the soil. Pious people have come to acknowledge this, and have found it not inconsistent with their belief in God, to whose existence these works bear witness. There is not only individual causation, that is, one cause producing its effect: there is combined and co-operative causation. I believe that J. S. Mill has shown that there is more than one agent in all physical causation. We speak of the cause of the killing of that plant to be the frost; but the full and true cause consists of the cold, and the state of the plant, without both of which the effect would not have occurred. I have shown that there is a like duality, or plurality, in the effect; each agent producing other effects. In almost all natural action there is a considerable number of agencies in the operation. What a variety of combined powers in the growth of every plant and in the production of spring!

While development consists essentially in a combination, or rather I would call it an organization, of causes, or, better still, a corporation of agencies for mutual action. Such are the united powers that produce the spring, that produce the plant, that produce the animal. Such are the activities which unite to produce the great events of history,—the rise and fall of literature in Greece, and of the Roman Empire, the Protestant Reformation, the English, French, and American Revolutions.

In many of these organizations I discover evident design. Such is the union of elements and powers producing vision,—the eyes and humors, the rods, cones, and nerves, so arranged as to enable us to see. Such are the vibrations, the canals, convolutions, hammer and stirrup, and fibres, which work together to give the power of hearing. Men are led spontaneously, and I hold reasonably, to believe that there is design in these collocations, and adaptations of one thing to another, to produce a good end.

In some cases there is only one set of agencies in the development. A number of agencies are thrown, as it were, into a closed ball (this was a Pythagorean idea); and these as they work produce certain results, which are the same from year to year, and from age to age. In other cases, powers come in from without to act upon and with the more central and abiding agents, and so far modify and vary their actions: hence the varieties in the same species of plants and animals, and the differences between events so far alike, such as the English, French, and American Revolutions. In evolution thus considered there is nothing irreligious, provided we see therein the wise God carrying out his designs, and connecting the past, the present, and the future in one grand system.

The great and utterly inexcusable error of certain physicists is, that they make development do everything, and supersedes all other natural powers, and even God himself. This has made so many good men turn away from the name and thing with aversion. But it is surely possible to maintain that evolution (that is, organized causation) reigns widely, even universally (that is, over all nature), and yet believe, that, like all creative action, it is limited, and is not the only process in operation, and that it is one, and only one, exercise of the mighty power of God. Let us notice its limitations.

1. It cannot give us the original matter, which must be there before it begins to develop. Its very name and nature indicate that there was something prior, from which it is derived. Whence did this come? We have clear proof that there is intelligence needed to organize nature (ἀνθρώπως, as Anaxagoras expresses it), and it is most reasonable to believe that He who arranged it also made it. At all events, evolution cannot give us the original matter, and we have to call in a power which I believe is still working.

2. Development cannot account for the beneficent order and special arrangements of the universe. Being itself blind, it might as readily work...
evil as good. A railway train, without a head and hand to set it on the track, might go on to destruction. We have to call in a power above itself to account for the beneficence of evolution. 3. There is evidence that new potencies have been added from time to time. Geology shows us new powers coming in. It is not possible to account for the actual phenomena of the world by a mass of molecules acting according to mechanical laws. There is a power of causing both the warm life in the original atom, or molecule formed of atoms. How, then, did life come in when the first plant appeared? Was there sensation in the original molecule? If not, what brought it in when the first animal had a feeling of pleasure and pain? Was there mind in the first molecule, say a power of perceiving objects out of itself? Was there consciousness in the first monad, say a consciousness of self? Was there a power of discerning things, of comparing and judging, of noting resemblances and differences? Had they the power of reasoning, of inferring the unseen from the seen, of the future from the past? Were there emotions in these primitive existences, say a hope of continued existence, or a fear of approaching dissolution? All sober thinkers acknowledge that there is no evidence whatever in experience or reason to show that matter can produce mind, that mechanical action can gender thought, that chemical action can manufacture consciousness, that electricity can reason, or organic structure give us the idea of the good and holy. According, then, to the principles of thinking and right observation, we have to call in powers above the original physical forces to produce such phenomena. In particular there must have been a special act when man appeared with intelligence and moral discernment, with free will and love.

4. When these new and higher potencies come in, they act upon and act with the previously existing powers. In our bodily frame, mind acts harmoniously with matter, and the two produce joint results. The memory proceeds upon the information given by the senses, and the understanding and the conscience presuppose both the senses and the memory. The Man is made of the dust of the ground; but there is breathed into him the breath of life, and he becomes a living soul.

5. As the result of the whole — of the action of the old forces and the introduction of the new — the work goes on in eras or epochs, in which we have, first, lifeless creation with all things mixed, then the separations of air from water, and of land from sea, the distinct appearance of the heavenly bodies, the forthcoming of plants, and animals rising higher and higher till they culminate in man.

6. This work combined — the evolution of the old and the superaddition of the new — is progressive, advancing from the inferior to the higher. This progress is still going on; and from causes now operating, especially from the intelligence and the industry of man, there will be an increased fertility and wealth; and the earth and its principal inhabitant will be brought to a higher and higher condition.

In regard to development, see, on the one side, **Darwin's** *Origin of Species and Descent of Man*, and **Herbert Spencer's** works, and, on the other side, **Dawson's** works, — **Fossil Men and their Modern Representatives, The Chain of Life in Geological Time, Life's Dawn, Nature and the Bible, The Beginning of the World according to Revelation and Science,** and **Mivart, On the Genesis of Species, and Man and Apes.**

II. Analogous to this there is evolution in the kingdom of heaven. Many interesting correspondences may be traced between the two kingdoms. The development of both the warm life in the original atom, or molecule formed of atoms.

There is first the blade, then the ear, and then the full corn in the ear. It is our privilege to live under the dispensation of the Spirit. There were anticipations of the operation of this blessed agent in the Old Testament, who converted and sanctified individuals. But these manifestations were only partial. "For the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified." But Jesus spoke of "the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive." When Jesus was taken up into heaven and glorified, the disciples waited for the promised blessing, which was fulfilled when the day of Pentecost was fully come, and the Spirit was poured out from on high.

When the spiritual begins to act, we have now two powers tending towards development and progression. First there are the mental powers, which have been acting previously, and which we may call the old or natural powers. Then there is the higher or spiritual power superinduced.

When a new power comes in, it does not set aside the old ones: on the contrary, it acts with them. We have this in the geological ages; for instance, in the introduction of intelligence in the midst of animalism. The senses continued to work, and to supply information, which is received, shaped, and guided by the intellect. When, at a further stage, the moral power came in, it did not supersede the intellect, which still operates, and tells us what things are; and upon this representation the Man is made of the dust of the ground; but there is breathed into him the breath of life, and he becomes a living soul.

6. This work combined — the evolution of the old and the superaddition of the new — is progressive, advancing from the inferior to the higher. This progression is still going on; and from causes now operating, especially from the intelligence and the industry of man, there will be an increased fertility and wealth; and the earth and its principal inhabitant will be brought to a higher and higher condition.

In regard to development, see, on the one side, **Darwin's** *Origin of Species and Descent of Man*, and **Herbert Spencer's** works, and, on the other side, **Dawson's** works, — **Fossil Men and their Modern Representatives, The Chain of Life in Geological Time, Life's Dawn, Nature and the Bible, The Beginning of the World according to Revelation and Science,** and **Mivart, On the Genesis of Species, and Man and Apes.**

II. Analogous to this there is evolution in the kingdom of heaven. Many interesting correspondences may be traced between the two kingdoms. The development of both the warm life in the original atom, or molecule formed of atoms. There is first the blade, then the ear, and then the full corn in the ear.
The issue of this joint action of the old powers and the new is progression. We have an example in the opening of Genesis, where new manifestations appear in successive days or epochs, the whole culminating in man, in the image of God. In the church there was first the shadow, and then the substance. These are first types, and then the archetype. There are promises and then performances, predictions and then fulfillments. "Howbeit, that was not first which is spiritual (πνευματικόν), but that which is natural (φυσικόν); and afterward that which is spiritual. " And so it is written The first man was made a living soul; the second Adam was made a quickening spirit" (1 Cor. xv. 44-46); where we may mark the advancement from the merely living soul (πνεῦμα ζωοτροφόν) to the quickening spirit (πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν).

There is undoubtedly progression, development if we properly understand it, in the revelation which God has been pleased to make of his will. In the antediluvian times there was light like that of the dawn. There were prefigurations under the Levitical dispensation more minute and specific than in the patriarchal dispensations. There is higher ethical teaching in the prophetic books than in the older Scriptures. There is more spiritual teaching in the New Testament than in the Old. Jesus, in the fulness of time, becomes the light of the world. There is the fullest revelation of specific truth in the Epistles of Paul and John. This progressive work goes on under the two sets of powers,—the old and the new. This does not entitle us to argue with some rational divines, that the new supersedes the old. This does not entitle us to argue, with some rational divines, that the new supersedes or sets aside the old.

Earnest minds have never been satisfied with such distant views of God as we have in causa tion and development. They have longed for and aspired after immediate communion with God. They have such in the dispensation of the Spirit. Here there is provision made for God dealing with each individual soul. There is room for convictions and conversions, for getting grace and more grace, for seasons of revival and refreshing. See MAN.

EWALD, Georg Heinrich August, one of the most learned Oriental scholars of the century; b. Nov. 18, 1803, in Göttingen; d. there of heart-dis ease, May 4, 1875. His father was a linen-weaver. In 1820 he entered the University of Tübingen, where Eichhorn was then teaching; but Ewald refused to have been much influenced by him. After teaching in the gymnasia at Wolfenbüttel for two years, he began in 1824 to teach as Repetent at Göttingen, and was made professor in 1827. In 1827 he was expelled from his position for having signed, with six other Göttingen professors, a protest against the revocation of the liberal constitution of 1833; which Ernst August, king of Hanover, effected. This action made him famous. In 1829 and 1836 he had visited France but not England. The same year he received a call to Tübin gen. He was never contented during his stay there, and came into bitter feud with Baur and the Tübingen school. After laboring ten years in Tübingen, he was recalled in 1848 to Göttingen, where he continued until 1866, when his bitter attacks upon the Prussian government, and his refusal to take the oath of allegiance to the king of Prussia, were punished with his exclusion from the faculty of philosophy; but he was still allowed his salary and the privilege of lecturing. This latter privilege was withdrawn in 1868 on account of utterances in his Praise of the King and the People (4th ed., Stuttgart, 1869). He continued the uncompromising foe of the Prussian monarch y, and in 1869, and twice afterwards, was sent as the delegate of Hanover to the Prussian Parliament. [In 1874 he was imprisoned for three weeks for libel against Bismarck, whom he accused of ruining religion and morality in the war against Austria, and of picking on the timid time for plunder and robbery in the war against France.]

Ewald was a solitary man. He was married twice; but from his childhood up he stood aloof from his fellows, had no intimate friends, and was, in an ever-increasing measure, intolerant of all opinions which contradicted his own. He felt himself called upon to go beyond the mere duties of the student and professor. He became a violent political pamphleteer, first against Ernst Georg of Hanover, and then against Prussia. He was always a storehouse of the most patient research. In 1827, subsequently enlarged, and Ausführung. Lehrbuch d. helbr. Sprache d. A. T., 1844, 8th ed., 1870 [Eng. trans. by Nicholson, Lond., 1856, of the Syntax alone, from 8th ed. by Kennedy, Edinb., 1879], also Hebr. Sprachlehre f. Ausf. Lehrbuch d. helbr. Sprache d. A. T., 1870, 8th ed., 1870 [Eng. trans. from 3d ed. by J. Y. Smith, Lond., 1870].
EXCOMMUNICATION.


An incident in Ewald's life, related by Dean Stanley in the Preface to the third volume of his Hist. of the Jewish Church, deserves mention here. While an Oxford student, Stanley visited Ewald at an inn in Dresden. During conversation the great scholar, grasping a small copy of the Greek Testament, said, "In this little book is contained all the wisdom of the world."

BERTHEAU.

EWING, Alexander, Bishop of Argyll and the Isles, Scotland; b. in Aberdeen, March 25, 1814; d. May 22, 1876. He was elected bishop 1846, and represented the Broad-Church school on the Episcopal bench. The characteristics of his theology have been thus presented: "He dwelt specially upon the illuminating power of Christianity as revealing the Fatherhood of God, and thus 'rolling back the clouds of human sin and sorrow,' so as even ultimately to 'exhaust hell of its darkness.' To him each attribute of God was equally light, and therefore he did not believe that any compromise had ever been effected between them. Christ was the supreme manifestation of that light, and the Bible was but the medium of its revelation, the means for enabling it to stream in upon the soul from sources beyond the mere letter of the truths which the written word contained. One of the chief of these external sources of light, specially welcomed by Ewing, was science, to the discoveries of which he looked forward as destined to lead to the higher aspects of Christianity than were yet fully realized." These views will be found in his volume of discourses, Revelation considered as Light, London and N.Y., 1873. See also Memoir of Alexander Ewing, D.C.L., by A. J. Ross, B.D., London, 1877.

EWING, Finis, one of the founders of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church; b. in Bedford County, Virginia, July 10, 1773; d. at Lexington, Mo., July 4, 1841. From Virginia he early removed to Tennessee, and subsequently to Kentucky. His education was limited; but, under the influence of the revivalist preachers, he offered himself as a candidate for the ministry, and was licensed in 1802 by the presbytery of Cumberland. In 1810 he formed, with two others, the presbytery out of which grew the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. He is the author of Lectures on Import. Subjects in Divinity, Nashville, 1824.


EXACTIONS, EXACTIONES, TALLIE, in ecclesiastical law, are taxes levied by the church on the congregation, either entirely new, or of an increased scale. They were forbidden already by the Council of Toledo, 589, and often afterwards.

EXARCH denoted a hierarchical title intermediate between patriarch and metropolitan. When the church adopted Constantine's civil division of the realm into dioceses and provinces, the prelate of a province became a metropolitan, and of a diocese an exarch; and it was declared legal to appeal from the metropolitan to the exarch. From the exarch, however, there could be no appeal to the patriarch; though the higher rank of the latter was generally conceded, and also indicated by the fact, that, for instance, the patriarchate of Constantinople was formed by the absorption of three dioceses, Pontus, Asia, and Thrace. In the fifth century the title of exarch seems to have disappeared. At present it is applied only in the Greek Church, corresponding to Vol. i.—iv., History of Israel, Lond., 1848 [Eng. trans. by Solly, Antiquities of Israel, 1867—74, 5 vols.]; D. Alterthümere d. Volkes Israel, 1848 [Eng. trans. by Solly, Antiquities of Israel, Lond., 1876]; D. drei ersten Evangelien übers. u. erklärt, 1859; D. üb. Buch Henoch, 1854; D. vierte Buch Ezra, 1860; D. Johann. Schriften, 1861, 1862; D. Bücher d. N. T. 1870, 1871; D. Theol. d. A. u. N. Bundes, 1870—75, 4 vols.

EXCLUSIVA, in ecclesiastical law, means the right, claimed by Austria, France, and Spain, to exclude each one candidate at a papal election. The right has never been formally acknowledged by the curia; but the claim has always, since the fifteenth century, been complied with by the conclave.

EXCOMMUNICATION. I. Among the Hebrews. —Any person or thing—man, animal, weapon, tree, or piece of ground—which to pious eyes seemed abominable, or dangerous, or incorrigible, the Hebrews used to set apart from common life, transforming it into a kind of ban-offering, and sacrificing it to God, for him to do with it what he pleased,—destroying it, or simply rendering it harmless, or perhaps forgiving it. This usage, of which traces are found both among the Gauls (Caesar, De Bello Gallico, 6, 17) and the Germans (Tacitus, Ann., 13, 57), was very old among the Hebrews, and showed itself conspicuously in their relation to foreigners, to heathenism, and to any thing opposed to their own system of religion. Not only objects of heathen worship, such as altars, idols, temples, etc., but even the larger part of the booty made in war, such as chariots, weapons, horses, etc., were destroyed. Whole cities, with all their inhabitants, every thing breathing within their walls, yes, whole nations such as, for instance, the Canaanites, were annihilated; and that not for political reasons, but on account of a religious principle.

Its most awful application, however, this principle obtained within the nation itself, as a weapon against any thing attacking the sacred institutions of the theocracy. It then became, not the fulfilment of a vow, but the execution of a punishment, and assumed the form of an excommunication. Thus a single person, or even a whole city, which broke the covenant with God, and fell into idolatry, was put under the ban, and with a curse abandoned to destruction. If a single person, he was killed (Lev. xxvii. 29): if a whole city, all that breathed within its precincts were killed, and the rest were burnt (Deut. xiii. 10). That which could not be thus destroyed, such as metal utensils, the soil, etc., became the property of the sanctuary (Lev. xxvii. 21—28).
**EXCOMMUNICATION.**

As instances, may be mentioned the punishment of the people of Succoth and Penuel (Judg. viii. 4–17), of Jabesh (Judg. xxi. 10), of Benjamin (Judg. xx. 48), etc.; in the course of time the rigor of the law abated, and the punishment assumed the character of a simple ecclesiastical penalty; as in the time of Ezra, when those Israelites who would not send away their foreign wives were excluded from the synagogue, and their property confiscated. In the period of the New Testament there seems to have been two different kinds of excommunication,—one milder (the ἀφορίζειν of Luke vi. 22), and another more severe (the ἀποκοοιτάζον τινος or κατακρίνειν of John ii. 22, xii. 42, and xvi. 2). The Talmud and the Rabbins also distinguish between two kinds of excommunication,—the ἀποκοοιτάζον, which was limited to thirty days, and to the most intimate relations, and which did not exclude from the service, though the excommunicated was compelled to enter the synagogue through a peculiar door; and the κατακρίνειν, which should be pronounced by at least ten members of the congregation, and meant not only exclusion from the temple and the synagogue, but also from intercourse with co-religionists. See Buxtorf: Lex. Talm.; Lightfoot: Horae Heb. ad Joh., 9, 22. Kutschi.

II. In the Christian Church.—On scriptural authority (Matt. xvi. 19, xviii. 18; John xxi. 23; 1 Thess. v. 14; James v. 15; 1 John i. 8, v. 16; 2 Cor. v. 18) grave sins were punished by excommunication,—the κατακρίνειν, which was limited to thirty days, and to the most intimate relations, and which did not exclude from the service, though the excommunicated was compelled to enter the synagogue through a peculiar door; and the κατακρίνειν, which should be pronounced by at least ten members of the congregation, and meant not only exclusion from the temple and the synagogue, but also from intercourse with co-religionists.

**EXEGESIS, EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.**

I. Definition.—One of the four leading departments of theological science, and lying at the base of the others,—historical, systematic, practical. It has to do with the interpretation of the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, which in the Protestant churches are regarded as the only infallible rule of the Christian faith and life, and the ultimate tribunal in all controversies. The term ἔκτομα (from ἔκτομον, to lead out, to expound) is borrowed from classical usage: the expounders of the oracles of Delphi, and the sacred rites in Athens, were called "exegetes" (ἐξηγοῦσιν). In the New Testament the verb occurs once, in John i. 18, where it is said of Christ that he declared or revealed (ἐξηγήσεται) the hidden being of God. Exegesis originated among the Jewish scribes, passed into the Christian Church, and is now most extensively cultivated in Protestant Germany, Holland, England, and the United States. Every theological school must, first of all, have a chair of exegesis or biblical literature: most of them have two or more, for the Old and the New Testaments.

II. Branches.—Exegetical theology, in the widest sense, embraces, beside exegesis proper, the following auxiliary and supplementary branches of theological learning: 1. Biblical philology (Greek for the New Testament, Hebrew and Chaldee for the Old Testament); 2. Biblical geography (Egypt, Mount Sinai, Palestine); 3. Biblical archaeology or antiquities; 4. Biblical history (from the creation to the close of the apostolic age); 5. Textual criticism (the restoration of the original text of the sacred writers); 6. A literary history of the Bible, usually called the Critical Introduction (including an account of the several books, their genuineness, integrity, authorship, time and place of composition); 7. History of the canon; 8. Biblical hermeneutics (the science of the laws of interpretation); 9. Biblical theology (the summarizing of the results of exegesis in systematic form). See those titles.

EXEGESIS.

1. **Philological or grammatico-historical exegesis.** This branch is concerned with the meaning of the words and the laws of language as they existed at the time of composition, according to the situation of the writer, irrespective of any doctrinal or sectarian bias. It implies a thorough knowledge of Greek and Hebrew, and familiarity with contemporary literature.

2. **Theological exegesis.** This is the development of the doctrinal and ethical ideas of the writers in organic connection with the whole teaching of the Scriptures, and according to the analogy of faith. It includes the application of the well-known results of grammatical and theological interpretation to the wants of the Christian congregation, and belongs properly to the pulpit.

3. **Homiletical or practical exegesis.** This is the application of the well-established results of grammatical and theological interpretation to the wants of the Christian congregation, and belongs properly to the pulpit.

4. **Historical exegesis.** This is the application of the well-established results of grammatical and theological interpretation to the wants of the Christian congregation, and belongs properly to the pulpit.

5. **Critico-historical exegesis.** This is the application of the well-established results of grammatical and theological interpretation to the wants of the Christian congregation, and belongs properly to the pulpit.

**IV. HISTORY OF EXEGESIS.**

1. **Jewish Exegesis.** Confined to the Old Testament. It began soon after the age of Ezra, but was first carried on by oral tradition of the scribes or Jewish scholars. It was especially devoted to the law (the Torah), i.e., the Pentateuch, and derived from its minute rules for the individual, social, and ecclesiastical relations. The body of these interpretations is called "Midrash." The prevailing method of exegesis was the rabbinical or literal. It excluded all foreign ideas, and was subservient to the strict legalism of the Pharisees. But among the Hellenist (Greek-speaking) Jews, especially in Alexandria, the allegorizing method obtained favor, especially through Philo (d. about 40 A.D.), who endeavored to combine the Mosaic religion with Platonic philosophy, and prepared the way for the allegorizing exegesis of Clement, and Origen of Alexandria. The Jewish rabbins of the middle ages cultivated grammatical exegesis at a time when the knowledge of Hebrew had died out in the Christian Church. The most distinguished among them are Ibn Ezra (d. 1167), R. Sal. Isaac or Rashi (d. 1105), David Kimchi (d. 1190), Moses Maimonides (d. 1204). Their commentaries are printed separately, and also in the so-called Rabbinical Bibles (e.g., of Buxtorf, Bel. 1618, 3 vols. folio).

2. **Patristic Exegesis.** The first use made of the Bible in the Christian Church was practical and homiletical. It was to the early Christians what it is still to the great mass of believers, and will be to the end of time—a book of life, of spiritual instruction and edification, of hope and comfort. Scientific or learned exegesis began when the Bible was perverted by heretics, and made to serve all sorts of errors. The Greek Church took the lead. Origen (185–254), the greatest scholar of his age, a man of genius and iron industry, is the father of critical exegesis. He is full of suggestive ideas and allegorical fancies. He distinguishes three senses in the Bible corresponding to the three parts of man: (a) A literal or bodily sense; (b) A moral or psychic sense; (c) An allegorical or mystic, spiritual sense.

3. **Medieval Exegesis.** This was purely traditional, and consisted of brief glosses (glossaria), or extracts from the fathers (called Catena Patrum). The original languages of the Bible were unknown in the West; and even the first among the scholastics had to depend upon Jerome's version for their knowledge of God's word. The prevailing method distinguished four senses of the Scriptures: (a) The literal, or historical; (b) the spiritual or mystic, corresponding to faith, teaching what to believe (credenda); (c) The moral, or tropological, which corresponds to love or charity, and teaches what to do (agenda); (d) The anagogical, which refers to hope (esperanda). These senses are expressed in the monosyllabic verse:—

"Littera gesta docet; Quid credas, allegoria; Moralis, quid agas; Quo tendas, anagogia."

The principal patristic compilations are: (a) In the Greek Church, those of Eusebius (d. 399), Theophylactus (d. 1007), Euthymius Zigabenus (d. 1115), and Nicephorus (fifteenth century); (b) In the Latin Church, Wallrafred Strabo (d. 849), Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274). The Catena aurea in Evangelia of Thomas Aquinas has been reproduced in an English translation by Pusey, Keble, and Newman.

Among the more independent biblical scholars of the middle ages who prepared the way for the Reformation, may be mentioned Nicolaus a Lyra (d. 1459); "Si Lyra non lysset, Lutherus non saltaret," and Laurentius d. (1456).

4. **The exegesis of the Protestant Reformers of the sixteenth century marks a new epoch.** It is full of enthusiasm for the word of God, and free from the slavery of ecclesiastical tradition. It went directly to the original Greek and Hebrew Scriptures, and furnished the best translations for the benefit of the people; while Romanism regards the Bible as a book for the priesthood, and discourages or prohibits efforts for its general circulation without note or comments. All the leading Reformers wrote commentaries, more or less extensive, on various books of the Bible. Luther (d. 1546), Melanchthon (d. 1560), Zwingli (d. 1531), Ecolampadius (d. 1531); the ablest of them are by Calvin (d. 1564) and his pupil and successor, Beza (d. 1603). Calvin combines almost all the qualifications of an expounder, in rare harmony; and his commentaries on Genesis, the Psalms, the Prophets, and all the books of the New Testament (except Revelation, on which he did not write), are valuable to this day. Beza, by his Greek Testament, his Latin version and notes on the New Testament, had great influence on the English version of King James.

5. **Protestant commentaries of the seventeenth century.** The works of Calvin (his Institutes of the Christian Religion) were published in Latin in 1559, and in French in 1560. This was almost the last word of modernism, and was received by the churches with an enthusiasm that was shared by all classes of readers. The works of the seventeenth century were the last to be compiled on the ground of the literal sense, and the first to be compiled on the ground of the moral sense.
and eighteenth centuries, by Hugo Grotius (d. 1645; Arminian); Vitrinia (d. 1722; Dutch Calvinist); Hammond (d. 1690; Church of England); Matthew Poole (Presbyterian; d. 1682); Annotations upon the Whole Bible, an English synopsis from his Latin synopsis; Matthew Henry (Independent; d. 1714; the best homiletical commentator of England; many editions, from 3 to 9 vols., Lond. and N.Y.); Patrick, Lowth, Adam (Lutheran; d. 1763, 9 vols.); Philip Doddridge (Independent; d. 1751; author of Family Expositor); J. A. Bengel (Lutheran; d. 1752; author of the Latin Gnomon of the New Testament, twice translated into English, and largely used by John Wesley in his Notes, an admirable specimen of mutum in paro); Thomas Scott (Family Bible, London, 1796, 4 vols., 11th ed., 1810; under the title Intexta: Critical Sacri (London, 1690, 9 tom., Amsterdam, 1698–1732, in 13 vols.), compiled from the principal commentators, as an appendix to Walton's Polyglot, under the direction of Bishop Pearson and others; Poole's Synopsis Criticorum aliquamque S. Scriturae inter pretium (London, 1690–79, 4 vols. in 5 fol.), a very useful abridgment from the Cruci sacri and other commentators.

6. Exegesis in the nineteenth century. It is exceedingly prolific, chiefly German, English, and American. The Bible is now more studied than ever before, and with a better knowledge of the languages, antiquities, geography, and history. We can only mention a small number of works.

(a) Commentaries on the whole Bible: Lange's Bibelwerk (Bielefeld and Leipzig, 1857–77, in 16 parts; English translation, with large additions, by Philip Schaff, aided by more than forty American contributors, New York and Edinburgh, 1894–80, in 25 vols. royal 8vo, including a separate volume on the Apocrypha and a complete index); a threefold commentary, critical, doctrinal, and homiletical, for the use of ministers and theological students; John Gill (d. 1778); a Commentary in French, by Professor Reuss, in Strassburg (Paris, 1875–81, in 13 parts, with an index), is independent and critical; Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown, A Critical, Experimental, and Practical (Edinb., repub. in Phila., 1875, in 6 vols., and at Hartford, Conn., in 1 vol.); Henry Cowles (d. 1881) commentaries, N.Y., 1861–81, 16 vols.; The Speaker's Commentary, suggested by the speaker of the House of Commons, ed. by Canon F. C. Cook, aided by a number of bishops and presbyters of the Church of England (London and New York, 1871–82, in 10 vols., 6 for the Old, 4 for the New Testament), less learned, but more popular, than Lange, and, like the Church of England, eminently respectable and conservative; The Pulpit Commentary, ed. by Canon Spence and Rev. Joseph S. Excell, aided by a large number of English divines (London, 1880 sqq.), to embrace many volumes; similar in plan to Lange's Commentary.


(d) The present century has also produced a large number of exegetical works of the first order on separate books of the Bible, which it would be impossible here to enumerate. Among recent commentators on one or more books of the Old Testament, Gesenius (Isaiah), Ewald (the poetical and prophetical books), Hupfeld (the Psalms), Hitzig (Psalms, minor prophets), Hengstenberg (Psalms, etc.), Delitzsch (Psalms, Isaiah), Keil (historical books), Schlottmann (Job), Stuart (Daniel, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes), Joseph A. Alexander (Psalms and Isaiah) occupy the first rank.

Of New-Testament commentators on special books must be mentioned Winer (on Galatians, Fritzsche (Matthew, Mark, Romans; all in Latin), Tholuck (Romans, Hebrews, Sermon on the Mount), Lüke, Bleek, Harless, Stier, von Hofmann, Godet, Stuart, Hodge, Alexander, Stanley, Jowett, Ellicott, and Lightfoot. Among these, again, the following commentaries may be recommended as being very useful for a critical study of the Greek Testament: Tholuck on the Sermon on the Mount; Lücke on the writings of John; Luthardt on the Gospel of John; Keil on the four Gospels; Morison on Matthew and Mark; Tholuck, Forbes, Philippi, Hodge, Beet, and Shed on Romans; Stanley on Corinthians; Wieseler on Galatians; Harless on Ephesians; Bleek on the Hebrews (especially the large work in 3 vols.); Beck on the Pastoral Epistles; Elliott on the Apocalypse; Elliott on Galatians, Ephesians, Thessalonians, and Pastoral Epistles (republished in Andover); Lightfoot on Galatians, Philippians, and Colossians; Godet on Luke, John, and Romans (in French, and trans., in Clark's For. Theol. Libr.).

EXEMPTION.


EXEMPTION, in ecclesiastical law, means the transference of persons or institutions from the jurisdiction of their nearest regular superior to that of some special or higher superior. The most noticeable instance of exemption in the Roman-Catholic Church is found in the history of monasticism. The monks were originally subject to the jurisdiction of the bishop. See the Council of Chalcodon, 451, can. 4 (c. 12, Can. XVI. q. 1; c. 10, Can. XVIII. q. III.). But in course of time a single monastery and the union of whole orders, succeeded in liberating themselves from the episcopal rules, and placing themselves immediately under the Pope. The change, however, did not take place without contest; and the acts of the Councils of Constance and Trent show the bitterness which prevailed on both sides. In the Reformed Churches there was no use for exemptions, except in cases in which the Reformed and the Roman-Catholic Church met each other in the same parish. The first instance of exemption in the Reformed Churches was that of the prince, who placed himself outside of the regular ecclesiastical jurisdiction; then followed, in some countries, that of the royal officers, in others, that of the army, and in others, that of the whole nobility, etc.

EXERCISES, Spiritual (exercitiaspiritualia), a term applied, in the Roman-Catholic asceticism, to certain exercises in meditation and mortification practices, both by ecclesiastics and laymen, generally under the guidance of the confessor, and partly as general penance, partly as a preparation for the Lord's Supper, ordination, etc. It was Ignatius Loyola who developed this institution of spiritual exercises to its highest and most elaborate form; and Pope Alexander VII. granted full absolution to any one, ecclesiastical or layman, who for eight days should practise these exercises in a house of the Jesuits, and according to the method of Loyola. See The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius of Loyola, trans. from the Latin by Charles Seager, Baltimore, 1819.

EXETER, chief town of Devonshire, Eng.; population, 34,600; on the Exe, ten miles from its mouth, in the English Channel; is on the site of the old Roman town of Caer Isca, and the present bishop is Dr. Frederick Temple, who was consecrated 1869.

EXILE. See Captivity.

EXODUS, Book of. See PENTATEUCH.

EXODUS OF THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL.

The Pharaoh of the exodus is Menephthah I., the son of Rameses the Great, the Pharaoh of the oppression. According to history, Amosis I. was the Pharaoh of the oppression, and Thothmes I. that of the exodus—has been given up by R. S. Poole, formerly its chief advocate, in his article upon Egypt, in the ninth edition of the Britannica. The date of the exodus may be set down as April 15, 1317 B.C. The other view mentioned would put it in 1455 B.C. A striking though strangely unnoticed passage in Herodotus seems to add confirmation to the accepted date. (See Schaff, Through Bible Lands, p. 102.) He says that the son of Rameses, whom the Greeks called "Sesostris," "undertook no warlike expeditions, being struck with blindness, owing to the following circumstances. The water of the river had taken an unusual height of eighteen cubits, and had overflowed all the fields, when, a sudden wind arising, the water rose in great waves. Then the king, in a spirit of impiety, seized his spear, and hurled it into the strong eddies of the stream. Instantly he became blind, and remained so for a long time; after a little while, he became blind, continuing without the power of vision for ten years" (II. c. 111). This reads like a confused reminiscence of Menephthah's overthow in the Red Sea. It is no objection that the king is said to have lived ten years thereafter; for the Bible-account does not compel us to believe that the Pharaoh perished then. The monuments, as was to be expected, contain no account of the disaster.

The route of the exodus is thus described in Scripture language: "The children of Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth" (Exod. xii. 37); from Succoth they went to Etham, in the edge of the wilderness (xiii. 20); there they turned, and encamped "before Pi-hahiroth, between Migdol and the sea, over against Baal-Zephon" (xiv. 2). In Numbers (xxxiii. 2-10) there is another account, which presents the same facts in a more condensed form. The identification of the localities mentioned is not yet settled; but that given by Ebers seems most probable. This is: Rameses was Al Maskhuta, at the head of the Wady Tumilat; Succoth, Sehet (Taustabum of the Romans), north-east of Lake Timnah; Etham (fortress), a frontier town less city; Pi-hahiroth, Ajrud, a fortress a few miles north-east of Suez ("Pi" is merely the Egyptian article); Migdol, Bir Suweis, about two miles from Suez; Baal-Zephon is Mount Atakah.

The collection of the great multitude—six hundred thousand men and their women and children, or in all between two million and three million—was the work of three or four days. The rallying-place was Rameses (el Maskhuta). To this point the Israelites streamed from different parts, as they had been directed to do so. The existence of this organization explains the fact that they marched in some sort of order. Yet they had so recently been emancipated, and were so entirely unarmed, that it was, humanly speaking, impossible for them to stand an attack from the disciplined Egyptian army. Accordingly, when Moses had led them as far as Etham...
upon the highway to Palestine, the seat of a garrison, he abruptly turned to the south, and went south for fifty miles until they reached Pi-hahiroth, over against Baal-Zephon, in the neighborhood of the present Suez. But their sudden disappearance from Etham naturally led the garrison there to believe that they had become entangled in the wilderness, and word to that effect was sent to Pharaoh (Exod. xiv. 3). The explanation of the delay in their pursuit is, that the universal bereavement had centred the attention of the Egyptians upon their funeral-rites, which required some ten weeks (Gen. i. 3), and which were paramount in importance. Nothing could be done until they were over. At the end of the seventy days, active measures were taken to bring back the fugitive slaves; and to the Israelites came the dismaying intelligence that the host of Pharaoh was upon their track. Before them was the Red Sea, behind them the angry host. No wonder they muttered, and said to Moses in bitter irony, "Because there are no graves in Egypt [that land of graves] hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness?" (Exod. xiv. 11.) But man's extremity is God's opportunity. "Moses stretched out his hand over the sea; and the Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong [north east wind all the night, and made the sea dry land, and the waters were divided. And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground; and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand and on their left." (Exod. xiv. 21, 22).

There are three chief explanations of these verses. 1. The Arab tradition locates the crossing a few miles south of Suez, where the sea is about ten miles broad, and supposes the host to have made the distance thither in the night. This view meets best a literal interpretation of the narrative; for then the waters would have been a veritable wall upon either hand, and is maintained by von Raumer (Zug der Is. aus Aeg. nach Canaan, Leipzig, 1837). But it would have required an accumulation of miracles to have brought them to the place in so short a time, especially as there is but a narrow footpath between the Arab huts on each side, and the memory of the wind suggests that God employed natural means. Hence this view may be dismissed for the second.

2. The crossing took place at the head of the gulph, near or north of Suez. The gulf is here horn-shaped, and is a mere channel about four miles long by less than a mile wide. At low water, small islands and sand-banks are visible in it, and it is fordable by those acquainted with it. The strong wind laid this stretch bare, and over it the Israelites crossed. The waters had been driven into the south-west bay; and there they were a wall on the one hand, while those of the open sea were a wall on the other. The miracle was, as Dr. Robinson says, a "miraculous adaptation of the laws of nature to produce a required result."

3. The theory now associated with Brugsch ("Zoro et autres monuments egyptiens, Leipzig, 1875, for trans. see below in LIT.") although it is older, having been advocated as early as 1726 by Hermann van der Hardt, and recently by M. J. Schleiden (Die Landenge von Suez, Leipzig, 1858), Sayce adopted it in 1881. According to this, the Israelites assembled at San (Zoan); and the "crossing" was not over the Red Sea at all, but over the Serbonian bog. To this view there are so many objections, that, as Dr. Bartlett says, it "derives its chief importance from the eminence and ability of its latest advocate (Brugsch)." It requires a renaming and replacing of every locality,—in itself, be it granted, no insuperable objection. *Yam Suph* is the Serbonian bog; *Mara* is the Bitter Lakes; *Elim* is Thent-remu; *Etham* is just before one crosses the lowest part of Lake Menzaleh; *Pi-hahiroth* is at the hither side of the Serbonian bog; *Baal-Zephon* is Mount Casius, upon the Mediterranean Sea. There the Israelites crossed, and came south-west and south to Ain Musa. The theory turns upon the meaning of *yam suph*. The words mean literally the weedy or reedy sea. Surely they fit better the shallow, reedy lakes of North-eastern Egypt than the Red Sea; but the stubborn fact is, that they are uniformly applied to the latter by the Seventy, who had the best means of knowing what the Hebrew meant; and thus the argument upon which the theory rests is worthless, and all Brugsch's learning and enthusiasm cannot give it value. He derives his proofs mainly from the following letter, written, Geikie thinks, to recall the *gendarme* who had watched the wall at Takhu, a fortress on the eastern frontier of the Delta, when the Hebrews, prior to the exodus, were advancing toward it. It reads thus: "Notice! when my letter reaches you, bring the Madjai at once, who were over the foreign Saatki who have escaped. Do not bring all the men I have named in my list. Give attention to this. Bring them to me to Takhu, and I will admit them and you" (Hours with the Bible, vol. ii. p. 182).

That the Seventy were correct in interpreting *yam suph* by τῆς βυθοὺς ὠκεανοῦ ("the Red Sea") is very plain when another passage in Exodus is compared. Thus (Exod. x. 19) the locusts were cast by a west wind "into the Red Sea" (εἰς τῆς βυθοὺς τοῦ ἐρυθροῦ); but it would have required a south wind to have blown them into the Serbonian bog.

There are other objections to the Schleiden-Brugsch theory. Ebers contests the Egyptian proof. Dr. Bartlett (p. 171) urges that the identification of Rameses and Zoan "seems incompatible with the use of both names in the Scriptures and in the same book (e.g., Numbers), without a hint of their identity." Dr. J. P. Thompson, in the Bibliotheca Sacra for January, 1875, adds: (1) "This theory, locating Rameses at Zoan, would require the Israelites, first to march a long distance, and over the Serbonian bog, in the same direction towards the Philistines, contrary to the express statement of Exod. iii. 17; (2) That the supposed route would take them on the most direct way towards the Philistines, contrary to the expression of Exod. iii. 17; (3) That the leading of an army into the treacherous Serbonian bog, when there was a military road of a great thoroughfare south of it, was a stratagem and a blunder not supposable in Moses, much less in Egyptian generals who were accustomed to the whole region, having frequently led their armies to the east."
EXORCISM.

It is important to remember that the night of the crossing was a terrible one. In the language of the Psalmist, "The clouds poured out water; the skies sent out a sound; thine arrows [the lightnings] lightened the world; the earth trembled and shook." (Ps. lxvii. 17, 18). The pillar of fire was between the Israelites and the Egyptians: so where the latter, accustomed to see the flaming torches at the head of the host, supposed the van of the Israelites to be, there was really their rear. Misled, therefore, they forced their jaded horses onward, thinking they had already got into the very midst of the flying slaves. Under divine guidance, and perhaps miraculously hastened, the Israelites made the crossing in safety; but the Egyptians labored under unexplored difficulties. "At the morning watch the Lord looked unto the host of the Egyptians," and "troubled" (i.e., threw them into confusion), and "took off their chariot-wheels, so that they drove them heavily." The morning dawned. The Egyptians saw their slaves upon the bank, but saw also that the sea had broken its barrier, and was pouring in upon them. Amid groans and curses the pride of Egypt's army sank beneath the waves; while the Israelites sang their new song: "Who is like unto Thee, O Lord, among the gods? who is like unto Thee, glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders?" "Thus the Lord saved Israel that day out of the hand of the Egyptians, and Israel saw the Egyptians dead on the seashore." For the after-route of Israel, see WILDERNESS OF THE WANDERING.


EXORCISM (εξορκισμός, "adjuration"), a solemn adjuration with the intent of expelling evil spirits. Our Lord cured many cases of demonic possession, and conferred the power to do the same upon his disciples (Matt. x. 8). They were, however, not always successful (Matt. xvii. 19). The Jews likewise professed to have the power of casting out evil spirits; and Josephus mentions that it was done in his day with the aid of roots and a ring, by which the demon was extracted through the nose.

In the early church, exorcism was regarded as a charism which belonged to all Christians. Tertullian (Apol. 33) lays it down as an indisputable fact that the simple command of a Christian was sufficient to expel evil spirits. Origen (Cont. Celsum, VII) testifies to the same thing, and notices that no artificial incantations were used. At a later period the exorcist was one of the four inferior orders of the clergy, and received ordination (Apost. Const., VIII. 26). Bishop Cornelius of Rome (251) makes mention of this. The Roman-Catholic priesthood are still ordained exorcists before being ordained priests.

It was the practice to exorcise catechumens, on the principle that all who did not believe in Christ belonged to the Devil. In the case of children at baptism, the priest breathed upon the child. The name of Christ, or a simple passage of Scripture, was considered efficacious in exorcism.

The Greek and Latin Churches still use not only formulas of exorcism at baptism, but also practise it over those actually possessed. In the latter case the patient is first sprinkled with holy water, after which the priest says, "I exorcise thee, unclean spirit, in the name of Jesus Christ; tremble, O Satan, thou enemy of mankind," etc. The Calvinistic Churches, at the Reformation, renounced exorcism. But Luther and Melancthon favored its retention, and the other Lutheran theologians followed them. Hesshusius, in 1583, was the first to propose its omission, but was answered by Memus, in a tract (De Exorcismo), 1590. At present exorcism is given up; and the catechumens in the Lutheran Church says, "I renounce the devil and his works," etc. [The English Church retained exorcism in the Prayer-Book of Edward VI., the priest saying, "I command thee, unclean spirit, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, that thou come out and depart from this infant," etc. It was, however, omitted in the revised Prayer-Book; and the seventy-second canon of the Church of England expressly forbids any priest attempting to expel demons. See SMITH and CHEETHAM, Dict. Antiq.]

EXPECTANCY (exspectantia, exspectativa, gratia exspectiva), in canon law, means a prospective claim to an ecclesiastical benefice, granted before the benefice has actually fallen vacant. This custom, for giving a man a successor before the hands of strangers; and it might also be successfully applied as a check to too narrow provincial interest in the appointment of ecclesiastical officers, whereby the general interest of the church was made to suffer. But it soon developed into a hideous cancer,—an opportunity for greed, fraud, and violence. Already the Lateran Council I (De Exorcismo) 1179 forbade this custom, but in vain. It was restricted by the Council of Constance, again forbidden by the Council of Basel, and finally abolished by the Council of Trent. Only in one case the Council of Trent still acknowledged it (Sess. 25 de reform. c. 7),—in the case of the appointment of a coadjutor to a bishop with expectation of succession.

EXPIATION. See ATONEMENT.

EXPIATION, Feast of. See Atonement, Day of.

EXSUPERIUS, Bishop of Toulouse in the latter half of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century, distinguished himself by the noble charity
he showed during the frightful depredations of the Alani, Vandals, and Suevi, neglecting his own sufferings in order to administer to the sufferings of others. Jerome dedicated his commentary on the Prophet Zechariah to him. See Act. Sancl., Sept. 26.

EXTREME UNCTION (the rite of anointing the dying with oil) is the fifth of the seven sacraments of the Roman-Catholic Church. It is based upon Mark vi. 13 and Jas. v. 14, 15. In both these cases the rite is applied for the purpose of healing the sick, not in order to prepare them for death; which is the principal meaning of the sacrament in the Catholic Church. As for the fathers of the Greek Church, it will suffice to say that John of Damascus treats only of baptism and the Lord's Supper under the mysteries of the Church. Among the writers of the Western Church, Ireneus has been appealed to as the first witness to the existence of the institution; but Ireneus (I. 21, 5) simply says that the Herculane-nites, a Gnostic sect, anointed the dying with a mixture of oil and water to protect them from hostile spirits in the other world. This practice by no means implies, as Bellarmine and other Catholic theologians affirm, a church sacrament of which it was a perversion. Tertullian and Cyprian, who describe at length the customs of the Western Church, do not mention extreme unction, while they discuss the Lord's Supper and baptism at length.

The use of oil, however, for producing miraculous cures, is noticed by many of the Fathers. Tertullian (Ad Scap. 4) mentions that Proculus healed the Pagan Severus, the father of Antoninus, with oil. Popular superstition took hold of these cures, and went so far, that, as early as the fourth century, we find the people stealing the lamps from the churches in order to reserve the oil for miraculous cures (Chrysost. Hom. 32, in Matth, vi.). They did the same with the baptismal water. This superstition was the germ of the subsequent sacramental idea of the Church. The transition is apparent in a letter of Innocent I. (416) to Bishop Deceius of Eugubium, which expressly calls a kind of sacrament (genus sacramenti). But the application of the oil was not confined to the priesthood: it was the prerogative of all Christians. From the close of the eighth century the rite is mentioned very frequently in the acts of councils. Theodulf of Orleans (789) and the first Council of Mayence (847) associate repentance and the Eucharist with it. The synod of Chalons (813) attributes spiritual as well as physical efficacy to the oil; and the synod of Regiasticum (850) calls the rite a healthful sacrament (salutare sacramentum), of which one must partake by faith in order thereby to secure forgiveness of sins, and restoration of health. The question consequently arose in the twelfth century, whether the anointing could be repeated. Gottfried, Abbot of Vendome (1100), and Ivo, Bishop of Chartres, answered in the negative. The popular idea was, that those who received anointing must partake by faith in order thereby to touch the earth with bare feet, to eat meat, etc. Councils spoke out against this superstition; but it contributed not a little to give to the act the solemn significance subsequently attached to it. For the first time in the twelfth century do the expressions "extreme unction" and "sacrament of the dying" occur.

Hugo de St. Victor (d. 1141) was the first to introduce its treatment into a theological system; and Peter Lombard gave it the fifth place among the seven sacraments (Sentent., iv. 23). Thomas of Aquinas developed at length the doctrinal definition and significance of the rite. Eugenius IV., at the Council of Florence (1439) and the Decrees of Trent (Sess. xiv.), gave the final definition of the Church. The latter declare extreme unction to be a real sacrament instituted by our Lord, and revealed by James.

The purpose of the sacrament has been variously stated. The first idea was, that it healed the body. Peter Lombard says that it serves for the "remission of sins and the alleviation of bodily infirmity." Albertus Magnus (in Lib. iv. 23, 14) held that it removed the remainders of sin unexpiated by penance, or unwashed away by baptism; and Aquinas defined these remainders as spiritual weakness. He says that the physical restoration is only a secondary end. The Council of Trent states that the purpose of the sacrament is "to confer grace, and heal the sick."

The oil of anointing is consecrated by the bishop, and the act of anointing is alone performed by the priest. The Council of Mayence (847) limited its application to those in peril of death. The Roman Catechism confines it to the very sick, but denies it to children, and criminals condemned to death. Thomas of Aquinas held that the eyes, ears, nose, mouth, hands, reins, and feet should be anointed.

The Greek Church calls the sacrament euchelaion ("prayer" and "oil"), and gives it the seventh place among the sacraments. The consecration of the oil is the prerogative of the priest; and the rite, which may be repeatedly administered, is only in extreme cases applied in private dwellings. In all other points its practice and definition agree with those of the Latin Church. [The late Bishop Forbes of Brechin (d. 1875), in his exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, calls the anointing of the sick the lost pleiad of the Anglican Church.]

LIT. — Besides the writings of the scholastic theologians mentioned above, see DALLEUS: De duoibus Latinorum ex Uctione Sacramentis, etc., Genes., 1659; LAUNOY: De Sacramento Uctionis agrorum, Paris, 1873.

EYLER, Rubelmann Friedrich, b. April 5, 1770, at Hamm, in Westphalia, where his father was preacher of the Reformed congregation, and professor of theology; d. at his estate, near Hamburg, Feb. 8, 1852; studied theology at Halle, where he became a pupil of Niemeyer; and became preacher at Hamm in 1794, court-preacher at Potsdam, 1806, superintendent, 1817, and afterwards member of the Council. He was a prolific writer; but his greatest influence he exercised as the confidential adviser and intimate friend of Friedrich Wilhelm III. His best-known and most widely read work is in Characteristische und historische Fragmente aus dem Leben Friedrich Wilhelms, 1944, 3 vols. He also published collections of sermons, and devotional books of a general description, and wrote in support of the attempted union of the Reformed and Lutheran Churches within the Prussian dominion.
EZEKIEL (God will strengthen, or the strength of God), one of the prophets of the exile. He was the son of Buzi, and a priest (Ezek. i. 3). He lived in his own house (lii. 24, viii. 1), on the River Chebar, near Tel Abib, among the captives whom Nebuchadnezzar had deported with King Jehoiachin. He was called the son of a priest (iv. 1) and of its priestly family, and of the Chaldean (xvii. 17).

Ezekiel was a master in the description of the grang and substructure of the temple; as, for example, in the detailed account of the reconstruction of the temple, its holiness, and its priests, and conclude with a description of the stream of living waters flowing out from the temple, and the new parcelling out of the land among the tribes.

The peculiar position of the author in Chaldea, separated as he was from Jerusalem and the excitement of passing events, his prophecies differ from those of the older prophets (Jeremiah, for example), in that they are not adapted to arouse immediate activity, there are many references to an account of the reconstruction of the temple, its holiness, and its priests, and conclude with a description of the stream of living waters flowing out from the temple, and the new parcelling out of the land among the tribes.}

Ezekiel delights to give perfect pictures. His symbolism and imagery are rich, but here and there so enigmatical as to have frequently discouraged both Jewish and Christian expositors, and to have led the Jews to forbid their people from reading it before the had achieved their third year. But the prophet is a master in the description of the grand and sublime; and many passages are examples of the finest lyric and elegiac poetry; as, for example, the lamentation for the princes of Israel (xxiv. 15-xxvii.), the dirge over Pharaoh, represented under the image of the crocodile (xxxii.), etc.

Although he excels as an author, he is not to be regarded as never having spoken his prophecies. His popular eloquence is expressly attested in chap. xxxii. 30 sqq. And, in the absence of immediate activity, there are many symbolic acts with which he used to emphasize his prophetic utterances,—eating and drinking (iv. 9 sq.), shearing his hair (v. 1 sqq.), stamping with his foot (vi. 11), etc. His own person was a type (xxxiv. 24, 27), and the circumstances of his life were of his nation's destiny (xxiv. 15 sqq.). The prophecies are usually introduced with such formulas as "Thus saith the Lord," and "The word of the Lord came." The prophet is addressed by God and angels by the title "Son of man." These and other peculiarities attest the originality and unity of the composition. In common with Jeremiah, Ezekiel draws upon the earlier prophets, and, in a larger measure than
Jeremiah, he shows the influence of the Mosaic legislation (comp. chaps. xiii.–xvi.), and the historical comp. Gen. ii. 8 with Ezek. xlviii. 13, xxxi. 8 sqq., xxxvi. 35, and Gen. i. 28 with Ezek. xxxvi. 11).

The spiritual and theological teachings of the book. The characteristic of Ezekiel is, that having an exile in a foreign land, and living in a period of disintegration, he points to a better time in the future. The whole of Ezek. xiv. onward, from the restoration of Jerusalem, he predicts the fall of the Jewish State as unavoidable, and pronounces the hopes of the patriots, based upon treaties with Egypt, as altogether illusory. The minuteness and detail of these prophetic references must impress us all the more when we bear in mind the prophet's separation from Jerusalem (see xii. 12 sq., xxxi. 23 sqq., xlii. 2, etc.). But Ezekiel restored again in the picture of his visions the old institutions of the temple, and in a pure form. In these descriptions his priestly training shows itself; but he did not, in his concern for the outward form, overlook the ethical and spiritual. In chap. xviii. he urges the double duty of honoring God, and loving our neighbor, and reminds his hearers of their individual and personal responsibility. He insists upon the necessity of a new heart (xi. 19 sq., xxxvi. 25 sqq.). God's glory is the ultimate end of the restoration of Jerusalem (xxxvi. 22), and his aim not to destroy, but revive, his sinful people (xxxiii. 11). It is the prophet's peculiarity that his eye is directed not so much to the personal representatives as to the kingdom itself, where the glory of God should dwell in the midst of a holy nation of priests, serving him (xlii. 7). The description is given in the last eight chapters, and stands alone in the Old Testament. The vision here recorded of the temple is not of a mere building, although the architectural proportions given are exact. He passes beyond the material edifice to an ideal temple with its waters of life (xlviii. 7 sq.). But it was not his purpose to revise it, or he would have made some reference to the ark of the covenant, the highpriesthood, the day of atonement, etc. As of special significance for the times, he mentions the Sabbath (xx. 12 sqq.), refers to a more joyful celebration of the feasts in the future (xlv. 9 sqq.), insists upon the purification of the temple (xliii. 7, xlviii. 9), and bases the new division of the land on the equal rights of the tribes, all of which were to receive portions west of the Jordan.

The book has given difficulty to the Jews, because its statements do not always agree with the ritual of Moses; and this gave rise to some dispute regarding its canonical dignity. But this very fact is a pledge that not the letter of the law, but God's will, which was therein only expressed in a way adapted to the time, is eternal. The Christian Church has also found difficulty in distinguishing between that which was merely Jewish in the prophecies, and that which is Messianic. Less clearly than in the other prophets can the distinction be made out between the spiritual and the material in the visions of Ezekiel. In the book, it is, nevertheless, a prophecy of the new covenant of grace in the language of the old covenant of the law. The complete consummation of the kingdom of God on earth, however, alone can reveal how far the form in which Ezekiel clothes it was mere shadow, how far an adequate picture of that perfect manifestation. (For the influence of Ezekiel on the Apocalypse, see Revelation.)

Lit. — Besides the Introductions to the O. T., by Eichhorn, De Wette, Bleek, Keil, Davidson, Reuss, see the Commentaries by Havernick (Erlang., 1848); Hitzig (Leipzig, 1850); Floth (Weimar, 1864, 1865, 2 parts); Hengstenberg (Berlin, 1868, 2 parts, Eng. trans., Edinb., 1869); Keil (Leipzig, 1868, 2d ed., 1882, Eng. trans., Edinb., 1876, 2 vols.); Zückler, in Lange (Bielefeld, 1875, Eng. trans., New York, 1876); Smend (Leipzig, 1890); (English) by Patrick Fairbairn (Edinb., 1851, 3d ed., 1863); Henderson (London, 1855, reprinted Andover, 1870); Cowles (N.Y., 1867); Currie, in the Speaker's Comm. (London and N.Y., 1876). — Leher: Les trois grands prophètes, Paris, 1877. Special Works. — Solomon Bennett: Temple of Ezekiel, London, 1824; W. Neumann: D. Wassertempel (exposition of Ezek. xlvii.1-12), Berlin, 1849; Balmer-Rinck: D. Prophet Ezekiel's Ge- sicht v. Tempel, Ludwigsb., 1858. For homiletical treatment, see Guthrie's Gospel in Ezekiel.

EZ'ON-QA'BER, or GE'BER (giant's backbone), a city in the neighborhood of Edath, mentioned as the last station of Israel before entering the Wilderness of Zin (Num. xxxiii. 35; Deut. ii. 8), and as the navy station of Solomon (1 Kings ix. 26; 2 Chron. vii. 17) and Jehoshaphat (1 Kings xxii. 49); but its precise site has not been identified.

EZ'RA (help), priest, scribe (Neh. viii. 1, 2), and reformer of the period succeeding the Babylonian captivity. The book which bears his name, and the latter part of Nehemiah, are the only reliable sources of his life. He was of high priestly descent (Ex. vii. 1). With Artaxerxes' consent he led an expedition to Jerusalem (458 B.C.). He must have been held in esteem at court; for the king intrusted him with authority to appoint magistrates and judges, and with the power of life and death in Jerusalem (vii. 12–20). At the River Ahava (vii. 15) he gathered the members of the expedition together, and ordered a fast and prayer for divine protection. Arriving in Jerusalem, he delivered up the gifts the king had sent to the temple and his commissions to the Persian officials (viii. 30). He was grieved to find that his countrymen had intermarried with women of other nationalities, and succeeded in inducing them to put away their "strange wives." The narrative is here suddenly broken off, and Ezra does not re-appear again for thirteen years (Neh. viii.). The conjecture has been made, that he returned to Persia during the interval; but nothing certain is known. He performed priestly functions after his return. The time of his death is not noticed. Ezra marks an epoch in the study of the Mosaic law. He made that study the employment of his own life (vii. 10), and was thus led to become a scribe of the law (vii. 11). He had about him a corps of helpers (Neh. viii.), with whose aid he read the book. In the book, the author has expounded it. The pulpit first made its appearance in connection with him (Neh. viii. 4), and became the original of those synagogical desks
from which Jewish rabbins in succeeding centuries read and interpreted the history and sacred writings of Israel. He was afterwards looked up to with reverence by the scribes as the founder of their order. According to Kuenen and others, Ezra was the author of a large share of the Pentateuch,—the so-called priestly Torah. According to the somewhat modified view of Professor W. R. Smith (The O. T. in the Jewish Church, chap. ix), he at least "gave the last touches to the ritual" of the Pentateuch, which he calls the "Canon of Ezra." (See PENTATEUCH.) Tradition, which is rich in details of Ezra's life, once says that he restored the entire Pentateuch (which had been lost), either from memory, or by special inspiration. In another place it describes him as the president of the great synagogue, and the collector and editor of the canon. The latter is made very probable when we remember the intense interest he had aroused in the law. In this interest a desire to have the writings of the his torians and prophets would certainly be begotten. According to Josephus (Ant., XI. 5, 5), he died and was buried in Jerusalem. According to other writers, he died on a journey to the king of Persia, in the hundred and twentieth year of his age; and Benjamin of Tudela mentions that his tomb was shown on the banks of the Tigris.

Ezra, Book of (a chronicle of events occurring between 536 and 456 B.C.), consists of parts, the first of which extends through chap. vi. Between these two sections lies an interval of fifty-eight years. The first section (i.-vi.) gives an account of a decree for the reconstruction of the temple, and its achievement by Zerubbabel. Chap. i. gives the decree of Cyrus, and relates the return to Jerusalem. Chap. ii. enumerates those who returned. Chap. iii. describes the arrangements for work upon the temple, and the laying of the corner-stone, amidst the mingled weeping and rejoicing of the spectators. Chaps. iv. and v. give an account of the efforts, on the part of adversaries who had been refused the privilege of participating in the work, to check its progress, and their subsequent success in securing a royal decree to that effect. But work was again resumed by order of Darius, and the temple completed (vi.). The second section (vii.-x.) has Ezra for its chief actor. Artaxerxes grants him permission to lead a company of the exiles to Jerusalem, and confers upon him considerable authority (vii.). The members of the expedition are mentioned, and their halt at the River Ahava, and arrival in Jeru salem, described (viii.). Ezra laments the domestic condition of his people (ix.), and rides Jewish homes of their "strange wives" (x.).

The authenticity of the history recorded in the Book of Ezra is generally conceded. The facts are such as might be expected, and there is no reference to the miraculous to arouse suspicion. The main questions are the authorship, and the relation of the Book to Nehemiah. The Jewish Church, and the church fathers, regarded Ezra and Nehemiah as a single work. They are followed in this view by many modern scholars (Ewald, Bertheau, Dillmann, Davidson, etc.), who hold, that, with the two Books of Chronicles, they formed parts of one great work. But the LXX. and the Vulgate separate them into two books. This division (defended by Keil, Schultz in Lange's Commentary, Rawlinson in the Speaker's Commentary, etc.) has in its favor the opening words of Nehemiah: "The words of Nehemiah," etc. Their union in the Hebrew canon may be explained by the fact that they are chronicles of one and the same general period of restoration.

The Authorship.—It is not disputed that Ezra wrote chaps. vii.-ix. He here speaks in the first person. The preceding portion of the book and chap. x. have been attributed to other authors. The reasons urged are the laudatory reference to Ezra in chap. vii. 6, and the use of the third person instead of the first (vii. 6, 11, x. 1). But examples of such transitions are found both in other portions of Scripture (comp. Isa. vii. 1-18 with viii. 1, etc., also Dan. vi. 4 with vii. 2) and in profane writers (e.g., Thucydides, comp. Hist., I. 1 with I. 20-22, etc.); and the notice of vii. 6 is not so laudatory but that a modest man might have written it. The second objection would be equally valid were Ezra only the general editor, which it is generally acknowledged he was. The reasons are not sufficient to overthrow the traditional view, which is defended by Keil (Einleitung), Lange, Rawlinson (Speaker's Commentary),—that Ezra was the author of the whole work. The text of Ezra is in a bad condition, and many variant readings exist. Portions of the work are in Chaldee (iv. 8-11, x. 1-3), and the decree of Artaxerxes, xii. 12-28. The language bears a close resemblance to that of the Chronicles and Daniel.

Lit.—See Introductions to the Old Testament by BLEEK, KEIL, REUS, etc., and Commentaries by BERTHEAU (Leipzig, 1862), KEIL (Leipzig, 1870, Eng. trans., Edinb., 1873), CANON RAWLINSON in the Speaker's Commentary (London and N.Y., 1873), SCHULTZ in Lange (Bielefeld, 1876, Eng. trans., N.Y., 1879), ROSENWEIG (Berl., 1870), B. NETTLER (Münster, 1877), also art. Ezra, by Bishop Hervey, in Smith's Bible Dict. D. S. SCHAFF.
FABER, Basilius, b. at Sorau, in Nether-Lusatia, 1520; d. at Erfurt, 1575 or 1576; studied at Wittenberg; was a teacher in Nordhausen, Tennstedt, and Magdeburg, and became rector of the school of Quedlinburg in 1560; but, being a strict Lutheran of the Flacian wing, he refused to sign the Corpus Doctrinae Philippicam as a crypto-Calvinistic innovation, and was discharged in 1570. Next year, however, he was made rector of the gymnasium of Erfurt, where he remained till his death. Besides some writings of pedagogical interest,—Theaurus eruditionis scholasticae (1571), and Libellus de disciplina scholastica (1572)—he translated Luther's commentary on Genesis into German (1557), was a contributor to the Magdeburg Centuries (1557—60), and published some eschatological tracts.

FABER, George Stanley, D.D., an English divine, and uncle of the former; b. Oct. 25, 1773; d. Jan. 27, 1854. He was educated at Oxford, and became fellow and tutor of Lincoln College. In 1801 he delivered the Bampton Lectures, which appeared under the title of Horæ Monaica. In 1803 he left the university, and was vicar at various places, till he was made prebendary of Salisbury Cathedral (1831), and master of Sherburn Hospital (1832). He was a man of varied erudition, and a voluminous author of theological works; among these the principal are, The Origin of Pagan Idolatry, 3 vols. (1816), Difficulties of Romanism (1826), Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, 3 vols. (1828), and Papal Infallibility (1851).

FABER, Johannes, is the name of several Roman-Catholic theologians of the sixteenth century, whose persons and writings are often confounded. —I. Johannes Faber of Leutkirch (called Malteus Harreticorum, from the book named below), b. at Leutkirch, in Swabia, 1478; d. in Vienna, May 21, 1541; studied theology and canon law at Tübingen and Freiburg-im-Breisgau; and was vicar-general of the diocese of Constance (1518); chaplain and confessor to King Ferdinand (1524); and Bishop of Vienna (1531). He belonged originally to the humanistic and liberal party, and maintained friendly relations to Erasmus, Ecolampadius, Zwingli, and Melanchthon. In 1520 he corresponded with Zwingli in a cordial and familiar manner; in 1521 he openly disapproved of Eck and his manoeuvres; but in the same year he made a journey to Rome in order to straighten some difficult money matters, and he returned as one of the busiest and most violent adversaries of the Reformation and the Reformers. He wrote against Luther Opus adversus nova quadam dogmata Lutheri (Malteus in heresin Lutheranam), and, in defence of celibacy and the papal authority, Pro calibatu and De potestate papae contra Lutherum. He fought on the Roman side in the conferences and disputations; and he was active in burning people in Austria and Hungary (Kaspar Tauber and Balthasar Hubmeier). Of his works there is a collected edition in 3 vols. fol., Cologne, 1537—41, and a minor collection containing only his polemical writings, Leipzig, 1537. — II. Johannes Faber Augustanus, d. about 1530; was b. at Freiburg, in the latter half of the fifteenth century; entered the Dominican order, and was made prior of the monastery of Augsburg in 1515, professor of theology at Bologna in 1516, confessor to the Emperor Maximilian I., and afterwards court-preacher to Charles V. He was a friend of Eras-
FABER.
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mus, and in favor of lenient proceedings against Luther, but he afterwards changed his mind, and became a harsh adversary of the Reformation. His funeral oration over Maximillian I. (Jan. 16, 1519) is the only work he has left. — III. Johannes Faber of Heilbronn was b. at Heilbronn, on the Neckar, 1504; studied theology and philosophy at Cologne; entered the Dominican order, and was made teacher at that cathedral of Trier, 1529, and at Erfurt, 1536. The date of his death is unknown. He was a bitter adversary of the Reformation, and wrote Quod fides esse possit sine caritate (1548), Enchiridion bibliorum (1549), Fructus quibus dignoscuntur harretici (1551), etc. — WAGENMANN.

FABER, or FAVRE, Pierre François, b. at St. Barthelemy, in the canton of Vaud; was minister of Laundun, in Lower Languedo; accompanied Francis de la Baume, Bishop of Haliarnassus, on his tour of visitation to Cochinn-China, as his secretary and confessor; and published in 1746 his Lettres édifiantes et curieuses sur la visite apostolique de M. de la Baume à la Cochinchine en 1740, which gives a report of the abominable manner in which the Jesuits pushed the mission in those regions, and the infamous intrigues with which they tried to cover up their misdemeanors. The book was condemned by the Bishop of Lausanne, and publicly burnt at Freiburg; and the Jesuits bought up every copy they could reach. Large extracts of the work are found in SIMLER, Urkunden zur Beleuchtung der Kirchengeschichte, i., pp. 159—256.

STREITZ.

FABER STAPULENSIS, Jacobus (Jacques Le- ttre d'Etapes), b. at Epiales, a village in Picardy, 1450; d. at Nérac, 1538; studied in Paris; visited Florence, Rome, and Venice; and began, after his return to Paris, to lecture on Aristotle, and to publish Latin translations, and paraphrases of the Aristotelian writings. From 1507 to 1520 he lived in the Benedictine abbey of St. Germain des Prés, near Paris, where his friend Briçonnet was abbot; and while here he began to study the Bible. The first result of this study was his Psalterium quintuplex, 1508; then followed, in 1512, his commentary on the Pauline Epistles, in 1513, on the Gospels, and in 1525, on the Catholic Epistles. A critical essay (De Maria Magdalena) which he published in 1517 gave the authorities occasion for an accusation of heresy; and Noël Bédier, syndic of the theological faculty of Paris, had the book formally condemned by a decree of Parliament, Nov. 9, 1521. Bédier, who suspected a secret Lutheran in Faber, wanted to institute further proceedings against him, but was prevented by the interference of Francis I. and Marguerite of Navarre in his behalf. In 1523 Briçonnet, who in the mean time had become bishop of Cardeaux, made him his vicar-general; and in the same year he published his French translation of the New Testament, which spread rapidly, not only in his own diocese, but all over France, and produced a deep impression. But after the battle of Pavia (Feb. 24, 1525), and the imprisonment of Francis I. in Madrid, the Parliament and the Sorbonne felt to employ more vigorous measures against the reformational movement. Several of the clergymen appointed by Briçonnet were accused of heresy; some of them recanted. Pauvant was burnt: Faber fled to Strassburg. After the release of Francis I., he was recalled, and made librarian in the royal castle of Blois; but even then he was not safe; and, after publishing his translation of the Old Testament, he retired to Nérac, the residence of Marguerite of Navarre, where he died. He had, indeed, espoused all the chief principles of the Reformation, and he applied them with vigor in his writings; but he remained in the Roman Church, hoping that the matter might be turned out any violent concussion. For open fight with hostile powers he was completely unfit. He was not unlike Melancthon, but he had no Luther by his side.

LIT. — GRAF: Essai sur la vie et les écrits de Lettre d'Etapes, Strassburg, 1842, and an elaborate biography in Zeitschrift für histor. Theologie, 1852, 1 and 2.

C. SCHMIDT.

FABER TANAQUIL. See LEFEVRE TAN-KOUY.

FABIAN, the nineteenth bishop of Rome (288—300).— II. — See also Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. VI. 29), incidentally present at the election after the death of Anteros, and was unanimously chosen, because a dove came down from heaven and rested on his head. Of his reign nothing is known with certainty. In Cyprian's Letters to his successor, Cornelius, he is often mentioned with respect.

FABRICA ECCLESIE, a technical term referring to the provision made for the maintenance of the fabric of the church,— its buildings, furniture, utensils, etc. In the latter part of the fifth century, Simplicius, and after him Gelasius, ordered that one-fourth of the whole revenue of a church should be put aside for this purpose, and afterwards the matter became the subject of a very varied and intricate, but wholly local, legislation. Thus, in the grand duchy of Baden, it is the rule that the nave and roof are kept in repair by the treasury of the church, the choir by the minister, the walls and outer buildings by him who enjoys the tenths, and the tower by the parish.

FABRICIUS, Johann, b. at Altorf, Feb. 11, 1644; d. at Helmstädt, Jan. 29, 1729; studied at Altorf and Helmstädt; travelled in Germany and Italy; and in 1708, was called to Helmstädt to the Chair of theology at Altorf, 1677, and at Helmstädt, 1697. His principal work, besides his Ammamitiae Theologicae (1690) and Historia Bibliotheca Fabriciana (4 vols. 4to, 1717—24), is his Consideratio variarum controversiarum (1704), in which he pursued the irenicical principles of Calixtus, but carried them unto weakness. In the same year a Gutachten was published, in which he most decidedly recommended the Princess Elizabeth Christine of Brunswick to embrace Romanism in order to get married to Charles of Spain; afterwards the Empress Charles VI.; but this Gutachten caused such a scandal, especially in England, that he was discharged from the university. See W. Hück, Anton Ulrich und Elisabeth Christine, Wolfenbüttel, 1846.

FABRICIUS, Johann Albert, b. at Leipzig, Nov. 11, 1683; d. at Hamburg, April 3, 1738; studied theology at Quedlinburg, and was made professor of rhetoric and moral philosophy at Hamburg in 1698. He was a very prolific writer, especially on literary history and bibliography, in which branches his principal works are: Bibliotheca Graeca (14 vols. 4to, Hamburg, 1705—25, re-
edited by Harless, 1790-1811); Bibliotheca Latina (3 vols., 1867), new edition, 1721, 1722, continued by the Bibliotheca Latina, media et insina aitae (5 vols., Hamburg, 1734-36); and the Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica (1718). More special theological interest have his Codex Apocryphon N.T. (1705, 2 vols.) and Codex Pseudepigraphus V.T. (1713), which have not been made superseded by the labors of Thilo, Tischendorf, Volkmar, and Hilgenfeld. He also wrote a Hydrotheologie (1730) and a Pyrotheologie (1732), which now strike the reader as very curious, but suited the taste of his time, and were translated into other languages.

FACULTY usually means some power, inborn or cultivated, and, in the special sense, a body of men to whom is given the right to teach a particular science (thus we have the faculties of theology, law, medicine, and philosophy); but it is also a technical term of canon law denoting the transference of a certain power of ecclesiastical jurisdiction from the original holder to a subordinate officer for the purpose of speedier execution. The earliest cases in which such faculties were granted occurred in the middle ages, when the Pope transferred a certain measure of his power to the missionary on account of his necessary independence of papal oversight through his distance from Rome. Later on, in the sixteenth century, similar faculties were granted occurred in the middle ages, when the Pope transferred a certain measure of his power to the missionary on account of his necessary independence of papal oversight through his distance from Rome. Later on, in the sixteenth century, similar faculties were granted occurred in the middle ages, when the Pope transferred a certain measure of his power to the missionary on account of his necessary independence of papal oversight through his distance from Rome.
latent source from which all individual development springs, mental and spiritual. Man was made just as the image and likeness of God - and this is the truth that makes the man. He who has lost his power of faith, his faculty of belief, is dead. But in no relation is this more true than in man's relation to God.

With respect to its form, faith is not a simple opinion formed by the intellect, and differing from cognition only by the subjective character of its evidences. The Church distinguishes between a fides historica ("historic faith") and a fides salvifica ("saving faith"). The latter is a movement of the heart, of all the fundamental powers of the soul, of the very roots of the personality; and hence it is propagated to all the branches: it involves knowledge, it stirs up the feelings, it acts upon the will. Knowledge, assent, and trust are all demanded in faith according to the doctrine of the Evangelical Church. None of them can be entirely missing; but their measure may be different, according to the different standpoint of the individual.

The object of faith cannot be seen by the eyes, nor can it be grasped by the understanding: it belongs to the realm of the invisible, the spiritual, the divine (Heb. xi. 1, 6; 1 Pet. i. 8; 2 Cor. v. 10; John xx. 28). But this invisible, spiritual, divine, is not something unknowable: it proves itself to the inner man. The absolute object of faith is the revelation of God to mankind, originating in his love, and making his holiness manifest: and the centre of this revelation, the true fulfilment in relation to which all preceding preparations are only accommodations to the susceptibility of the race (Luke xxiv. 25, 26; Heb. i.), is the incarnation of God in Christ. Faith, in the absolute sense of the word, is therefore a personal and spiritual union with Christ, through which we become one with him, as he is one with the Father.

This union with Christ man cannot accomplish by his own efforts: God himself must awaken the new life in his soul (John vi. 29; 1 Cor. ii. 5). It is the Holy Spirit who works the faith in the heart; and the means by which he does this is the preaching of the word of God; and faith is incumbent upon it; and observe the Feasts of the Passover. It is the work of the Holy Spirit, that movement of the heart will follow which is the faith, - the faith by which sins are forgiven (Acts xxvii. 18), and man is made just before God (Rom. iii. 26; v. 1; Gal. iii. 24).

The Roman-Catholic Church, proceeding from the teaching of James, teaches that justification is by faith and works. But though it defines faith as meaning belief, not simply as an opinion, but as a conviction that "those things are true which God has revealed and promised, and this especially, that God is just, and it is faith that makes as it is necessary for the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Conc. Trid., sess. VI. c. 6), it nevertheless confines faith to the sphere of the intellect, and only expects an influence from thence upon the feelings and the will. In its further development in the Roman-Catholic Church, this doctrine led to a direct deterioration of the idea of faith. From a living agency in the human soul, faith became merely a pact that makes the man. He who has lost his power of faith, his faculty of belief, is dead. But in no relation is this more true than in man's relation to God.

With respect to its form, faith is not a simple opinion formed by the intellect, and differing from cognition only by the subjective character of its evidences. The Church distinguishes between a fides historica ("historic faith") and a fides salvifica ("saving faith"). The latter is a movement of the heart, of all the fundamental powers of the soul, of the very roots of the personality; and hence it is propagated to all the branches: it involves knowledge, it stirs up the feelings, it acts upon the will. Knowledge, assent, and trust are all demanded in faith according to the doctrine of the Evangelical Church. None of them can be entirely missing; but their measure may be different, according to the different standpoint of the individual.

The object of faith cannot be seen by the eyes, nor can it be grasped by the understanding: it belongs to the realm of the invisible, the spiritual, the divine (Heb. xi. 1, 6; 1 Pet. i. 8; 2 Cor. v. 10; John xx. 28). But this invisible, spiritual, divine, is not something unknowable: it proves itself to the inner man. The absolute object of faith is the revelation of God to mankind, originating in his love, and making his holiness manifest: and the centre of this revelation, the true fulfilment in relation to which all preceding preparations are only accommodations to the susceptibility of the race (Luke xxiv. 25, 26; Heb. i.), is the incarnation of God in Christ. Faith, in the absolute sense of the word, is therefore a personal and spiritual union with Christ, through which we become one with him, as he is one with the Father.

This union with Christ man cannot accomplish by his own efforts: God himself must awaken the new life in his soul (John vi. 29; 1 Cor. ii. 5). It is the Holy Spirit who works the faith in the heart; and the means by which he does this is the preaching of the word of God; and faith is incumbent upon it; and observe the Feasts of the Passover. It is the work of the Holy Spirit, that movement of the heart will follow which is the faith, - the faith by which sins are forgiven (Acts xxvii. 18), and man is made just before God (Rom. iii. 26; v. 1; Gal. iii. 24).

The Roman-Catholic Church, proceeding from the teaching of James, teaches that justification is by faith and works. But though it defines faith as meaning belief, not simply as an opinion, but as a conviction that "those things are true which God has revealed and promised, and this especially, that God is just, and it is faith that makes as it is necessary for the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Conc. Trid., sess. VI. c. 6), it nevertheless confines faith to the sphere of the intellect, and only expects an influence from thence upon the feelings and the will. In its further development in the Roman-Catholic Church, this doctrine led to a
rites are Pagan ones, such as the shedding of the blood of a sheep or a fowl in a new house in order to render it habitable, the use of fire in purification of unchastity, and the worship of the goddess Sanbat, really the Sabbath. They originated, as simple acts of self-defence, from the side of the State; and it was repeatedly declared, both by Dr. Falk and Prince Bismarck, that, within the State, every confession (church) should have freedom to move and develop, but none the opportunity of crippling the actions of the State, or using the secular power for particular denominational purposes, or of eluding its civil duties, under pretence of some religious prescript. "We will never go to Canossa" (Nach Canossa gehen wir nicht) said the chancellor, May 14, 1872. The Ultramontane party, however, among the Roman-Catholic clergy in Germany, was very far from viewing the Falk Laws as merely defensive measures. On the contrary, it considered them as evidences and means of an intolerable tyranny; and encouraged by the Pope, whose encyclical of 1874 declared the laws null and void, the party adopted a policy of bitter and unflinching opposition. Several bishops were banished from their sees; and other sees, which became vacant by death, remained vacant. As a turn, however, took place in the course of affairs when Pius IX. died, in 1878. Prince Bismarck had observed more than once during the contest, that, as the so-called May Laws were merely defensive measures, it would be possible to abandon them, or at least to modify them, when once again there reigned a "peaceable pope" in Rome; and, indeed, immediately after the accession of Leo XIII., negotiations concerning a modus vivendi between Germany and the Pope were begun, and seem, on account of reciprocal concessions, likely to succeed. See Ludwig Hahn: Geschichte des Kulturkampfes, Berlin, 1881; and the addresses by Leopold Witte and August Dorner, in Evangelical Alliance Conference, 1873, New York, 1874.

FALL OF MAN. See SIN.

FAMILIAR SPIRITS (from the Latin familia, "a household servant") were the spirits supposed to be at the service of the necromancers, by which they divined, and wrought their spells (Lev. xx. 27; Deut. xviii. 11; I Sam. xxviii. 7, 8, and many other places).

FAMILIAR SPIRITS, Familiärs, or Familiars, Huis de Liefde, a sect founded by a certain Henry Nicholas, a native of Munster, who, after living for some time in Holland, came to England under the reign of Edward VI. His efforts to make proselytes seem at first to have succeeded quite well; even theologians were found willing to listen to his ideas. But in 1580 Elizabeth ordered an investigation, and after that time very stringent laws were passed against the sect, which disappeared during the reign of James I. The ideas of Henry Nicholas are often identified with those of David Joris, with whom he lived in close personal connection.
as his followers were often confounded with the
Albigenses, though they acknowledged the bap-
tism of infants, and showed no antagonism to the
rituals of the churches. The predominant trait of
the sect was its mysticism, which gave rise to
very peculiar doctrines of Moses as the prophet
of hope, Christ as the prophet of faith, and Henry
Nicholas as the prophet of love, etc. In 1530
they published a confession of faith, in which they
endeavored to prove themselves in harmony with
the Reformed Churches. See JOHN ROGERS.

The term "fanatik" was originally applied to
priests who pretended to receive divine revela-
tions, and announced oracles, but more es-
cially to the priests of Cybele and Bellana,
who were very peculiarly interested in this sect.
The word gradually changed its sense, and came
to imply something of a fraudulent inspiration,
consisting of hollow excitement and empty visions.
In this sense it was still used in the seventeenth
and eighteenth centuries, when applied, for instance,
to Cromwell, Mohammed, the prophets of the
French reformers. Among his most noticea-
tional works are: Sommaire, 1534, new ed. by Baum,
Geneva, 1867; Des Actes de la duphle de Rive,
1535 (first ed., Dufour, Geneva, 1866); Du cru
usage de la parole véritable, 1540; Traité de
purgatoire, 1548; La glaire de la parole véritable,
1540; Traité de la Cène, 1555, etc.

There is no collected edition of his works.

LIT.—His biography was first written anony-
mously (probably by Olivier Perrot; compare
HALLER, Biblioth. d. Schlesiergesen., III. No. 781),
then by ANCILLON, Amsterdam, 1691 (French);
KIRCHHOFFER, Zürich, 2 vols., 1831–33 (German);
SCHMIDT, Elberfeld, 1860 (German); JUNOD,
Paris, 1865 (French); and GOGUEL, Neuchâtel,
1875 (French).

HAGENBACH.

FAREW, one of the most famous monasteries of
Italy in the middle ages; situated on the Farfa,
in Central Italy; was twice destroyed,—in the
seventeenth century by the Lombards, and in the
tenby the Saracens,—but both times rebuilt.

By the victory of a short-lived re-action,
both were exiled in 1538. Farel
of a Prophet, 1771, new ed., 1810; An Essay
on the Demoniacs of the New Testament, 1775, 3d
ed., 1818 (these were, he maintained, merely per-
sons strongly affected by certain diseases).

This work is a classic with those who hold this view);

The General Prevalence of the Worship of Human
Spirits in the Ancient and Heathen Nations asser-
ted and proved, 1783. See Dobson, Memoirs of the

death. As a theologian he does not occupy a
place in the foremost rank; but practically he was
one of the boldest, as he was one of the first,
of the French reformers. Among his most noticea-
ble works are: Sommaire, 1534, new ed. by Baum,
Geneva, 1867; Des Actes de la duphle de Rive,
1535 (first ed., Dufour, Geneva, 1866); Du cru
usage de la parole véritable, 1540; Traité de
purgatoire, 1548; La glaire de la parole véritable,
1540; Traité de la Cène, 1555, etc.

There is no collected edition of his works.

LIT.—His biography was first written anony-
mously (probably by Olivier Perrot; compare
HALLER, Biblioth. d. Schlesiergesen., III. No. 781),
then by ANCILLON, Amsterdam, 1691 (French);
KIRCHHOFFER, Zürich, 2 vols., 1831–33 (German);
SCHMIDT, Elberfeld, 1860 (German); JUNOD,
Paris, 1865 (French); and GOGUEL, Neuchâtel,
1875 (French).
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FARNOVIUS, FASTING.

Life and Writings of the Rev. Hugh Farmer, Lond., 1806.

FARNOVIUS (Stanislaus Farnowski), one of the principal leaders of the Polish anti-trinitarians in the sixteenth century; studied in Heidelberg; became a disciple of Petrus Gonesius, and formed a Unitarian party, the Farnovians, which, however, amalgamated with the Socinians immediately after his death. See Bock: Hist. Antitrinitarianorum, Konigsberg, 1774-84, 2 vols.

FARTHING. See Money.

FASTIDIUS, a Christian writer of the fifth century, and one of the few literary representatives of the ancient Briton Church. What we know of his life we owe to a few critically uncertain notices in Gennadius (Catach. vib. 11., 63), which have given rise to many untenable and self-contradictory speculations. The only certain facts are, that he was a Briton by birth, and lived about 420. His book De vitu Christiana was originally printed anonymously among the works of Augustine, until Olstenius discovered the true author, and published the work separately, Rome, 1683. It shows a strong Pelagian tendency.

FASTING, among the Hebrews. Properly speaking, there was only one divinely-ordained public fast,—that of the Day of Atonement (cf. Lev. xvi. 29 sq., xiii. 27 sq.; Num. xiii. 7). But it was quite in accordance with the will of God, and the spirit of the Old-Testament dispensation, that when great national calamities had overtaken Israel, or great national wants arose, or great national sins were to be confessed, a day of public fasting and humiliation should be proclaimed (cf. Judg. xxi. 26; 1 Sam. vii. 6; 1 Kings xxi. 27; 2 Chron. xx. 3). During the Babylonish captivity the Jews observed four other fasts,—the fasts of the fourth, the fifth, the seventh, and the tenth months (Zech. vii. 1-7; viii. 19). The fast of the fourth month "took place on the 17th of Thammuz (about June or July), in memory of the taking of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, and the interruption of the daily sacrifice. According to tradition it was also the anniversary of making the golden calf, and of Moses breaking the tables of the law. "The fast of the fifth month," on the 9th of Ab, was kept in memory of the destruction of the first (and afterwards of the second) temple. "The fast of the seventh month," on the 2d of Tishri, commemorates the death of Gedaliah and his associates at Mizpah (Jer. xii. 2). "The fast of the tenth month" was on the 10th of Tebeth, when the siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar commenced.

To these fasts has been added that of Esther, kept on the 13th of Adar (Esth. iv. 18). Besides these six fasts, the Jewish calendar at present contains other twenty-two fast-days. But that is not all. It was customary to fast twice a week (Lev. xxi. 30). Thus every Wednesday and Friday were fast-days, because, according to tradition, Moses went up Mount Sinai the second time to receive the tables of the law on a Thursday, and came down again on a Monday. Very minute directions concerning fasting are contained in the Talmudical treatise Tractate Taanith. The Essenes earlyfasted as a means of subduing the flesh, often eating nothing for three days in succession. The present Jews fast on the Day of Atonement, wearing a white shroud and cap: hence the fast is called "the white fast." On other days, mourning is worn: hence they are called "black fasts." In the primitive church (Acts xii. 2, xiv. 23, xxvii. 9; 2 Cor. vi. 5, etc.), derived partly from the discipline of the synagogue, partly from spontaneous inspiration. By the Montanists it was considerably furthered (Tertullian, De jejunio), and still more so by monasticism; but it developed differently in the different churches.

I. The Church of Rome. — The principal fast of the Roman Church is the so-called Quadragesimal Fast before Easter, which a later time has designated as an apostolic tradition relating to the preceding of Moses (Exod. xxxiv. 28), and to the circumstances of our Lord lying forty hours in the grave. Originally this fast lasted only forty hours, but it was gradually extended. In the fourth century it lasted three weeks in Rome, but six in Illyria, Achaia, Alexandria, etc.; and this latter term was finally adopted also by Rome. As, however, there was no fasting on Sundays, the six-weeks' fast comprised only thirty-six fast-days; and, in order to reach the symbolical number of forty, it became customary to begin the fast on the Wednesday (Ash-Wednesday) of the preceding week. An attempt was also made to introduce a quadragesimal fast before Christmas and the day of John the Baptist; but the practice never became firmly established. See H. Liemke, Die Quadragesimalfasten der Kirche, Munich, 1853.

Fasting on certain days of the week is also an old custom of the Roman Church. The Pharisees fasted twice a week,—on Thursday and Monday, in commemoration of Moses ascending Mount Sinai, and again descending from it. The Christians adopted this practice, only the days and their signification were changed. Wednesday and Friday (feria quarta et sexta) were selected as the days on which our Lord was betrayed and crucified. These days were called dies stationum, the life of a Christian being compared to that of a soldier (Tertullian, De Oratione, XIV.). Wednesday, however, was afterwards dropped as a fast-day. The custom, prevalent among the Jews after the exile, of keeping a fast-day respectively in the fourth, fifth, seventh, and tenth months, in commemoration of the conquest of Jerusalem, the destruction of the temple, the murder of Gedaliah, and the beginning of the siege of Jerusalem, was also adopted by the Christians; but, in this case too, both the days and their designation were changed. The days were put down as days of general fasting and prayers, and so that the year thereby became divided into four seasons (quattuor tempora); hence the name of Quatember-fast. (See Ember-Days.) In former times these quarter-days were also days for the collection of taxes, and hence called angariae ("servitude"). The vigilae (which see) are also fast-days; and, besides these fast-days, the Roman Church also appoints extraordinary fast-days on special occasions.
II. The Greek Church has on this field developed different practices in its different sections; but one characteristic mark is common to them all,—strictness in keeping the rules. The principal facts are: 1. A quadragesimal fast before Easter, based on Matt. iv. 2; 2. A quadragesimal fast before Christmas (from Nov. 15 to Dec. 24), based on Exod. xxxiv. 28; 3. The Fast of Mary (from Aug. 1 to Aug. 10); 4. The Fast of the Apostles (from the day after Whitsuntide to June 29). The old dies stationum (both Wednesday and Friday) are still retained, except between Christmas and the Epiphany, during the third week after the Epiphany (in opposition to the Armenians), and in the weeks following Easter and Whitsuntide.

III. The Reformed Churches. The reformers were by no means averse to fasts; but they returned to the original conception of them, as a means of self-discipline and a preparation for prayer. They rejected all compulsory regulations of the practice, and wholly discarded the idea of direct moral meritousness. To this purport Luther expresses himself in his commentary to Matt. vi. 16; and so does Calvin in his Institutiones, IV. 12, 15, 15: "Therefore let us say something of fasting, because many, for want of knowing its usefulness, undervalue its necessity, and some reject it as almost superfluous; while, on the other hand, where the use of it is not well understood, it easily degenerates into superstition. Holy and legitimate fasting is directed to three ends; for we practise it either as a restraint on the flesh, to preserve it from licentiousness, or as a preparation for prayer and pious meditations, or as a testimony of our humiliation in the presence of God when we are desirous of confessing our guilt before him." Accordingly we find ideas of this or a very similar character incorporated with all the confessional books of the Reformed Churches (Confessio Augustana, XXVI; Conf. Helvetica Secund., XXIV.; Conf. Bohem., XVIII.; Conf. Gall., XXIV.; Westminster Confession, XXI. 5), and carried out practically in Switzerland, England, the United States, etc. When, shortly after, the revolution actually broke out, he took his place in the foremost rank of its champions. He was one of the leaders of the people in the attack on the Bastille (July 14, 1789), and in the next year he delivered in the rotunda of the corn-market an Eloge eulogique on Franklin, which appeared in the strongest manner to the revolutionary passions. Having contributed to the re-organization of the church by his Discours sur la religion nationale, he was made constitutional Bishop of Calvados in 1791, and by his diocese sent to the legislative assembly and the convention. In the beginning he followed the Jacobins unhesitatingly: but the trial of the king alarmed him. He spoke against the proposal to put the king to death, voted for the appeal to the people, etc., and, after the execution, he joined the Girondins, with whom he fell, accused, arraigned, and assassinated, deeming himself a true author. In the contest between Damasus and Ursinus, Faustinus sided with the latter, and by his Libellus precum moved Theodosius to interfere. His collected works are given in Migne, Bibl. Patr. Magn., XII. 98.
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FAUSTUS REJENSIS, or REGIENSIS, also called Faustus the Breton, or of Riez, an ecclesiastical writer of the fifth century, and one of the most important literary representatives of the so-called Semi-Pelagianism; was b. in Britain, or Brittany, towards the close of the fourth, or in the beginning of the fifth century; entered the church in 383, became its abbot in 434, and succeeded Maximus in 462 as Bishop of Reji or Regium, the present Riez, in Provence. In 481 he was expelled from his see by Eurich, king of the West Goths; but he returned in 494, and died at Reji till his death, in 491. He wrote letters and tracts against the Arians and Macedonians (Responsorio adjjecta quaedam de ratione fidei catholicae), against the Nestorians and Monophysites (Ad Gratum), on various dogmatical and ethical questions, especially on the nature of the soul, whose corporeality he asserted. He also wrote homilies and sermons, of which editions of the Six Sermones monachi are celebrated; but his principal work is the De gratia Dei et humanae mentis libero arbitrio liber I. In 474 the Gallic presbyter Lucidus gave a rather coarse-grained exposition of Augustine’s ideas of grace and predestination. Faustus answered, first in a Epistola ad Lucidum, and then in the above-mentioned work. In this book he refutes Pelagius, whom he calls pestiferus; but he also rejects Augustine, though he calls him quidam sanctorum. He attempts to take up an intermediate position, and he does it with great adroitness and no small acumen. The book proved a great success in Gallia; but in Constantinople and North Africa it met with bitter opposition, and Hormisdas afterwards declared that its author does not belong among those whom the church calls its fathers. A collected edition of Faustus’ works does not exist; but most of them may be found in Bibl. Patr. Magna, T. V. Pars III. 500; Bibl. Lugd., VIII.; Migne: Patrolo. Lat., LVIII., etc.

WAGENMANN.

FAUSTUS THE MANICHÆAN was an African by birth, a native of Milevis; settled in 383 in Carthage, but was in 386 banished by Messianus. He was the chief of the Manichæans of Africa, and was repeatedly excommunicated; but he, as well as his book, is known to us only through Augustine, who at one time wanted his instruction (Confessiones, V. 3, 6, 7, etc.), and afterwards wrote against him, Contra Faustum.

FAWKE, Guy. See Gunpowder Plot.

FEAST OF ASSES. See Asses, Feast of.

FEAST OF FOOLS. The celebration of the Pagan Saturnalia on Jan. 1 was continued in the Christian Church, and almost without restraint, although the church tried to give the festival a Christian character by celebrating it in honor of the circumcision of Christ. From Italy the festival was introduced into the whole Western Church; and in the twelfth century it was everywhere celebrated in Spain, France, Germany, and England, and generally in a most wanton way. A boy-bishop was elected, and surrounded by boys, boys-deacons, etc. He conducted service in the church, generally on some day before Christmas and New Year. In 1567 he was imprisoned between Christmas and New Year, for heizing the liturgical acts with travesties and parodies of the coarsest description, but all to the greatest amusement of the congregation. In the thirteenth century the church tried seriously to stop this disturbance; council after council, pope after pope, forbade it, but in vain. It was, indeed, the Reformation and the secular authorities which finally put a stop to the scandal. In Ducange, Glossarium, is found a complete ceremonial for the whole feast, written out in 1398, at Vivières, in southern France. See Du Tillier, Mémoires pour servir à l’histoire de la fête des fous, Lausanne, 1741.

FEASTS. See Festivals.

FEATHERS’ TAVERN ASSOCIATION, a society of three hundred English clergymen, and some laymen, in the latter part of the eighteenth century, demanding a revision of the Liturgy of the Church of England. Amongst other changes they sought the excision of the damnable clauses from the Athanasian Creed. The organization had a short existence, and accomplished nothing.

The name was taken from Feathers’ Tavern, the place where they met. See Bayly, Church History of England (Lond., 1849), p. 668.

FEATLY, Daniel, D.D., the author of The Dippers Dipt; was b. at Charlton, Oxfordshire, March 15, 1592; d. at Chelsea, April 17, 1645. After graduating at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, he went as chaplain with the English ambassador to the court of France. Returning to England, he became rector of Lambeth, and in 1627 of Acton. In 1643 he became member of the Assembly of Divines, and was the last of the Episcopal members to remain, but was expelled and imprisoned for revealing its proceedings. He is now remembered by his work entitled The Dippers dipt, or the Anabaptist ducks and plunged over head & ears at a disputation in Southwark (5th ed., 1648). This work against the Baptists originated in a disputation he held with four Baptists at Southwark, in 1641. In the dedication to the reader, he says, “I could hardly dip my pen in any thing but gall.” Other works by Featly are: Mystica Clavis, a key opening divers difficult & mystical texts of Scripture in 70 sermons, etc., Lond., 1636; Ancilla pietatis, or the handmaid to private devotion, etc., 8th ed., 1678.

FEDERAL THEOLOGY. See Coccioius.

FEHM COURT. See VEHM Court.

FELGENHAUER, Paul, b. at Putschwitz, in Bohemia, towards the close of the sixteenth century; d. at some unknown place, after 1660; studied theology at Wittenberg, and appeared, after his return to his native country in 1620, as a theosophic and mystical writer. In his Chronologie he demonstrated that the world would come to an end before 1755; in his Zeitspiegel he made a vehement attack on the corruption of the Reformed Church and the Lutheran clergy. Compelled to flee from Bohemia in 1623, on account of persecutions directed against all Protestants, he settled in Amsterdam, but continued his literary activity, which attracted much attention in Northern Germany, especially in the lower classes. The clergy began to be alarmed. They wrote against him. When he removed to Bederkesa, near Bremen, in 1636, they had him expelled. In 1657 he was imprisoned between Christmas and New Year, but shortly after dropped out of notice. A complete list of his works is given in Adelung: Geschicht d. menschl. Närheit, IV. 400 sqq.; Stark: Lübbecke'sche Kirchengeschichte, p. 790.

HAGENBACH.
FELICISSIMUS was appointed deacon in the Church of Carthage by the presbyter Novatus, without the assent of Cyprian, and belonged to that party which represented the aristocratical and presbyterian system of government in opposition to the monarchical and episcopal system, represented by Cyprian. Cyprian protested against the appointment, but did not depose Felicissimus; and when, shortly after, the Decian persecution broke out, he fled from the city, and left his see. During his absence the presbyters undertook to re-admit the lapsi into the church by virtue of the libellous pacis, which they procured from the martyrs. This, too, Cyprian considered as an encroachment upon his authority; and he sent an episcopal committee to the city. Felicissimus, however, supported by five presbyters, declared that he would admit none into the community of his church who appeared before the episcopal committee; and, when Cyprian returned (Easter, 251), he was formally excommunicated by the party of Felicissimus, which chose a certain Fortunatus for its bishop. Felicissimus himself repaired to Rome, to gain over to his side the Roman Bishop Cornelius; but, the Novatian controversy having at this time broken out both in Rome and Carthage, Cornelius and Cyprian were naturally allies, and Felicissimus' mission failed; after which nothing more is heard of him and his party.

FELICITAS is the name of two saints of the Roman-Catholic Church: one, a distinguished Roman lady, a widow, who, together with her seven sons, was martyred in Rome under Marcus Aurelius, and is commemorated on July 10; and another, a servant-girl, who was martyred under Septimius Severus, in Carthage, together with Perpetua, and is commemorated on March 7. See Act. Sancl., on the respective dates.

FELIX and FESTUS, the two governors of Judea (procuratores provinciae), appearing in the life of the apostle Paul, as told in the Acts, chap. 21-28. Other sources of information are: for Felix, JOSEPHUS (Ant., XX. 7: 1-8; and Bell. Jud., II. 12: 2-8); CHIARA OF MILANO, Reg. Ponli. Rom.—Felix II. (March, 457—Feb. 25, 492) was elected pope. Felix II. is a saint of the Roman-Catholic Church.
fered in the affairs of the Eastern Church. The Emperor Zeno issued the Henotic on the instance of his patriarch, Acacius, and for the purpose of reconciling the Monophysites. But Felix placed himself at the head of the opposition against this measure, and deposed and excommunicated Acacius at a synod of seventy-seven bishops, thereby occasioning the first schism between the Eastern and Western churches. See Act. Sanct., Febrar., III., and Jaffé: Reg. Pontif. Rom.—Felix IV. (July 12, 526—September, 530) was elected by the influence of Theodoric the Great, an Arian.—Felix V. (Jan. 5, 1440—49), Duke Amadeus of Savoy, was b. 1388, and d. Jan. 7, 1451. In 1434 he abdicated, left the government of Savoy to his son, and retired to Ripaille, on the Lake of Geneva, as head of the knightly hermit order of St. Mauritius. The process which the Council of Basel instituted against this measure, and deposed and excommunicated Nicholas V., Felix abdicated, and retired to Ripaille. His reign forms simply an interlude in the history of the Council of Basel, and is described in its acts.

FEFPLE, John, D.D., Bishop of Oxford, was born near Reading, Berkshire, June 23, 1625; d. July 10, 1686. He was educated at Christ Church, Oxford, of which his father was a dean. He was a royalist, and after the restoration of the Stuart was made dean of Christ Church, and in 1676 Bishop of Oxford. He was distinguished for learning, and munificent benefactions to the university. The following famous lines were written by a student to whom Dr. Fell had given the thirty-third epigram of Martial for translation:

"I do not like thee, Dr. Fell,
The reason why, I cannot tell;
But this I know, and know full well,
I do not like thee, Dr. Fell."

Among his works the more important were an edition of the Greek Testament, Lond., 1675 (which was the standard edition until Mili, and Paraphrase and Annotations upon the Epp. of St. Paul, Lond., 1675, 3d ed., 1703. See Hook, Eccl. Biog.

FÉLUS, François Xavier de, b. at Brussels, Aug. 18, 1735; d. at Mons, May 23, 1802; entered the order of the Jesuits in 1752; went to Hungary after the expulsion of the order from France, in 1770, and lived since 1798 at the court of the Bishop of Freising, in Bavaria. He was an exceedingly prolific writer, publishing about a hundred and twenty volumes during his lifetime, among which are the Journal of Luxemburg, 1774—94 (a periodical, 70 vols., but chiefly written by him), Discours, Cours, etc., 1771, 8 vols., etc. One of his most interesting productions is his Coup d'œil sur le congrès d'Emm, 2 vols., Dusseldorf, 1789.

FELTHAM, Owen, an author highly esteemed in his day, was born in Suffolk about 1609. At the age of eighteen he published Resolves, divine, moral, political, giving pointed moral and religious maxims. The work was subsequently augmented, and passed through many editions. The edition of 1608 contains the little that is known about his life, written by James Cumming.
in his *Sur le ministère des pasteurs* (“The Ministry”). This tract denies the divine authority of the Protestant clergy, on the ground that such authority depended upon regular episcopal ordination handed down from the apostles.

The year 1689 was an important epoch in Fénélon’s life. The king appointed him tutor for his grandsons—the Dukes of Burgundy (afterwards king of Spain), and Berri. For the duties of this office he was eminently adapted by the un tarnished nobility of his own character, high sense of honor, magnetic power, patience, and gentleness of temper. The Duke of Burgundy was of a violent temper [“so passionate that he would break the clocks which summoned him to some unwelcome duty, and fly into the wildest rage with the rain which hindered some pleasure,” as St. Simon says]. But the teacher succeeded not only in mollifying his disposition, and enriching his mind, but in securing the prince’s respect and gratitude. The king presented him with the abbey of St. Valérie, and in 1695 with the see of Cambrai; Fénélon, much to the former’s surprise, resigning the abbey at his elevation.

With his promotion to the archbishopric began a succession of hard conflicts and humiliations. In 1687 he had formed the acquaintance of Madame Guyon (see art.), which ripened into intimate friendship. It was a severe trial for him, when a theological examination of her devotional works was instituted, that he should have been placed on the commission. Bossuet, one of the commissioners, sought to secure his signature to the *InSTRUCTION SUR LE E’TS D’ORATION* (“Instruction about the States of Prayer”), which he had written in refutation of Madame Guyon’s views. Fénélon’s conscientious scruples forbade his assent; and Bossuet not only began to grow cold towards him, but to antagonize him. Fénélon never fully approved of Madame Guyon’s tenets and language, but always defended her intentions as above suspicion. In 1697 he made public his views on the subject, in *Maximes des Saints sur la vie intérieure* (“Maxims of the Saints on the Life of the Soul”). The work was a defence of Madame Guyon’s fundamentals, and elaborated the two propositions,—that the love towards God is a disinterested love of him for his own sake, and independent of the reward; and that, in the most perfect Christians, love is the predominant grace. Others professed to find the principle laid down in it, that perfect sanctification, and absolute rest in God, were possible on earth, and that a state of contemplative quietism, rather than of watching and conflict, was recommended.

Paris was split up into two parties over this work. Bossuet opposed it with passionate bitterness. Fénélon observed an exemplary moderation and patience. The king decided for Bossuet, and Fénélon was ordered to leave the court, and proceed to his diocese. He was received with joy, and at once devoted himself, with a consecration seldom equaled, to the duties of his see. He was unwearied in his visitation, preached in all the churches he visited, combated clerical abuses, and became the father and friend to poor and rich. His sermons were not studied works of art, but flowed with evangelical simplicity from the fullness of his heart.

In the mean time the controversy with Bossuet went on. Fénélon had submitted his case to the Pope, and sought his judgment upon the *Maxims of the Saints*, which Bossuet insisted he should renounce. The latter drew the most severe logical consequences from Fénélon’s work, and embodied them in an answer to his *Exposition des Maximes des Saints* (“Explanation of the Maxims of the Saints”), which he likewise sent to Rome. Fénélon answered every criticism with ability. In 1688 Bossuet wrote his *Relation du quétisme*, a history of the controversy, to which Fénélon replied in his *Réponse*, which aroused a very favorable feeling towards him. But the Sorbonne had already condemned twelve articles of the *Exposition*; and in 1689 a papal brief declared the *Maxims of the Saints*, and twenty-three articles drawn from it erroneous (not heretical). The general interest as to the archbishop’s course was speedily put at rest. Fénélon submitted unconditionally, finding the papal sentence severe but recognizing in it the “echo of the divine will;” and he believed only one course to be open to a true son of the church. He revoked the twenty-three articles, and forbade the circulation of the book in his diocese. Although, from the standpoint of the gospel, we cannot approve of Fénélon’s course, we cannot help but admire the spirit of moderation and humility which guided him during the whole progress of the controversy. Bossuet, on the one hand, eulogized his submission: the people, on the other, throughout France, had learned to esteem him.

The leisure he could find in the administration of his diocese, Fénélon employed in furthering the education of the Duke of Burgundy. This he did by correspondence. In order to instil in him the principles of justice and goodness, he gathered together the fragments of the *Télémaque*, and revised the whole. He gave the manuscript to a抄ist in order to secure a nearly-written copy for his ward. The抄ist made a second copy, without the knowledge of Fénélon; and it was printed at Paris under the title *Aventures de Télémaque* (“Adventures of Telemachus”), but, being suppressed by royal order, was reprinted in Holland in 1700. The book was translated into every language of Europe, and had one of the largest circulations of any book after the Bible. The king thought he discovered in the work a satire against his administration, but without just ground.

In 1712 Fénélon wrote two other works for the Duke of Burgundy,—*Dialogues des morts* (“Dialogues of the Dead”), and *Directions pour la conscience d’un Roi* (“Rules for a King’s Conscience”). The latter was first printed in Holland, 1734. It is full of sapient advice, and searching questions, such as only an experienced confessor could present. In 1713 appeared his *Démonstration de l’existence de Dieu* (“Proof of God’s Existence”), and in 1718 a most excellent treatise on eloquence,—*Dialogues sur l’éloquence*. The latter is composed in the purest and most classic French, and full of healthy and inspiring thoughts. The work consists of the writer’s own condition of an oration,—that it must prove, illustrate, and move. He holds up the Scriptures as the most perfect illustration of true eloquence, which the preacher cannot study too diligently.
The nobility of Fénélon's character was shown most conspicuously during the war of the Spanish Succession (1701-13), when his diocese was for a while the seat of war. In a general way he sought to mitigate the horrors and ravages of the war by his wise counsels to the Duke of Burgundy, who was commander-in-chief. When, in 1709, Flanders, in which Cambray was located, was desolated, he opened the chambers of his palace to the wounded, and when it was felt he offered his whole income to the state. The French admired their archbishop for his self-denying interest in the suffering and wounded, and bowed before his piety. No less did the enemies of France esteem his virtues; and Prince Eugene and Marlborough not only treated him politely, but sent troops to guard his property.

He died of a fever. His last days were peaceful. The latter part of the fourth chapter of Second Corinthians and the fifth chapter were read and re-read to him, affording great comfort. His piety caused the Principal of Gethsemane (John xvii), he lessed his attendants, and when God send it to us to repay them" (Answer to Renan Benedict, p. 11). He proved an excellent minister, "preaching," says Row (Hist. p. 418), "with great boldness, wisdom, and holiness," and "bringing the people [of his charge] to very good order, knowledge of the truth, and obedience to the discipline of the Kirk." As a church-leader, he was characterized by firmness, sagacity, sound judgment, and also what Wodrow (Anealeca, Glasgow, 1842, vol. I., p. 120) calls "pleasant and facetious conversation, by which," Wodrow adds, "he often pleased and pacified the king when he was in a fury." He was, accordingly, very frequently employed by the Church as a medium of communication with the king.

Ferguson published two tracts in his own lifetime. The first is a controversial work, entitled An Answer to An Essay written by Renan Benedict, the French doctor, to John Knox, and the rest of the brethren." This treatise was printed at Edinburgh, in the year 1563, and was reprinted for the Bannatyne Club in 1860, from a unique copy in the library of the University of Edinburgh. It contains an able discussion of the chief points at issue between the Romanists and Protestants at the period of the Reformation. His second publication appeared nine years afterwards, being a sermon preached before the regent and nobility at Leith (Jan. 13, 1571-72), during the meetings of the General Assembly. It relates chiefly to the inadequacy of the existing provision for the Reformed ministers, the schools, and the poor; and it condemns in no measured terms the neglect by the king and Parliament of objects regarded by the Church from the first as having paramount claims on their attention. The sermon was printed at the request of the General Assembly held at Perth in the year 1572, with the special approbation of five of the most eminent ministers of that day, to whom it had been submitted for revision; John Knox, then on his death-bed, giving his imprimatur in these words: "John Knox, with his dead hand, but glad heart, praising God, that,
of his mercy, he leaves such light to his kirk in this desolation." Ferguson is also the author of a posthumous work, entitled Scottish Proverbs: Gathered together by David Ferguson... and put ordinate alphabeticowhen he departed this lyfe (Edin., 1641).

Among his descendants many well-known names occur, including Adam Ferguson, minister of Logierait, who took a prominent part in the controversies connected with the Scottish secession of 1733, and his much more distinguished son, Dr. Adam Ferguson, professor of moral philosophy in the University of Edinburgh, and the author of a history of the Roman Republic (Lond., 1783), and other standard works. Principal Robertson, the historian of America and of Charles V., and Henry, Lord Brougham, also alike claimed lineal descent from the first minister of Dunfermline.

LIT. — The few facts now known as to the life of this eminent Reformer will be found in the books and documents quoted above, and especially in Row's Historie of the Kirk of Scotland from the year 1558 to August, 1637 (Edin., 1842), and in the introductory notice to the Bannatyne Club's reprint of Ferguson's Tracts (Edin., 1889), also already mentioned. Many of the "Sayings" of D. Ferguson will be found in the Wodrow Manuscript Collections preserved in the library of the University of Glasgow. See, also, Encyclopaedia Britannica (supplement), ed. 1824, a. v., Dr. Adam Ferguson, and Edinburgh Review for January, 1867 (vol. 125, pp. 48 sqq.). WILLIAM LEE.

FERMENTARIANS. See Azymites.

FERRAR, Nicholas, an English clergyman of ascetic tastes; b. in London, Feb. 22, 1592; d. Dec. 2, 1637. He studied at Clare Hall, Cambridge; in 1624 was elected to Parliament; and in 1626 was ordained deacon by the Bishop of St. David's (Laud). He consecrated himself to a life of retirement and devotion, and refused flattering offers to benefices. He turned his manor, Little Gidding, into a sort of conventual establishment, at which vigils and other formal religious exercises were scrupulously observed. Ferrar himself slept on the floor, and rose at one in the morning for religious meditations. He did much good by providing a free school for the children of the neighborhood, and himself catechised them. See Lives of Ferrar by Dr. Peckard (Camb., 1700), MacDonough (2d ed., Lond., 1837), and by his Brother and Dr. Jebb (1 vol., Camb., 1853).

FERRAR, Robert, Bishop of St. David's, and martyr: b. at Halifax, Yorkshire; d. at the stake, in Caermarthen, Wales, March 30, 1555. He studied at Cambridge and Oxford, and was elevated to the see of St. David's, under Edward VI., in 1548. Bishop Burnet (Hist. of Ref., I. p. 341) describes him as "a rash and indiscreet man," and as having been arbitrary in his treatment of the canons of his cathedral. At the accession of Mary he was deprived of his see, and tried and condemned for heresy. To a young man who deplored his death-sentence he is reported to have said, "If you see me come to the pains of burning, then give no credit to those doctrines for which I die." He made good his assertion, and was felled to the ground by a blow on the head. See Foxx: Acts and Monuments. Hook: Eccles. Biogr., vol. v.
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thrown into prison. Bessarion had to flee to Rome, etc. In 1472 the Greeks solemnly renounced the union.

Litr. — The authentic acts of the council are lost; but a documentary history of it, probably written by Archbishop Dorotheus of Mitylene, is found in vol. 9 of Haudin, and vol. 31 of Mansi. It is in favor of the union. From the opening of the council wrote Beza, who imbibed. Her mind de
courageous champions of the Reformation in
thrown into prison. Bessarion had to flee to
Rome, etc. In 1472 the Greeks solemnly re
nounced the union.

FERRARA, Renata (Renee), celebrated for her relations to the Reformers, was the daughter of Louis XII. of France, and wife of Hercules of Este, Duke of Ferrara, whom she married in 1527; was b. at the castle of St. Blois, Oct. 25, 1510; and d. at Montargis, June 12, 1575. Brought up in the court of Francis I., she came into intimate relations with Margaret of Navarre, whose evan
gelical sentiments she imbibed. Her mind de
lighted in the pursuits of literature and art; and her court at Ferrara attracted the learned men of Italy. She remained true to evangelical senti
ments, in spite of opposition and the forced sepa
ration of her children, and welcomed to her palace
Ochino, Peter Martyr, Calvin, and other evan

FERRER, Vincentius, b. at Valencia, Jan. 28, 1357; d. at Vannes, in Brittany, April 5, 1419; entered the Dominican order in 1374; studied at Barcelona and Lerida; wrote Tractatus de moderno Ecclesiae schismate. visited Paris; was appointed confessor to Queen Yolanda of Aragon; wrote Tractatus de spiritu, and exposition, and was in 1395 called to Avignon by Benedict XIII. as Magister Sacri Palatii. But two years later on he gave up this position, and determined, in spite of the opposition of the Pope, to devote his life to missionary labors. Travelling on foot through France, Italy, Spain, and England, he preached, often twice a day, in the streets or on the road, to great crowds. Soon he was not alone any more. A wandering congregation formed around him, accompanying him everywhere, practising the severest asceticism, and filling the towns and the fields with their sombre songs. He was canonized by Calixtus III., June 29, 1455. See Bongk, Hist. de l'Egl. r. de Nimes, 1856.

FERRIS, Isaac, D.D., LL.D., b. in New York, Oct. 3, 1790; d. at Roselle, N.J., June 18, 1873. He was graduated from Columbia College, 1816; a pastor in the Reformed Dutch Church over differ
ent charges (New Brunswick, N.J., 1821-24; Albany, 1824-30; New York, Market Street, 1834-54); and chancellor of the New York University, 1852-70, emeritus, 1870-73. His service to the university was long and faithful. By his efforts a crushing debt of a hundred thousand dollars was extinguished, four professorships endowed, and several new departments added to the course of instruction. He possessed great sagacity, common sense, and administrative ability. As preacher, pastor, and professor, he was beloved. His presence was majestic. He delivered the address at the Jubilee of the American Bible Society, New York, 1865, subsequently published,
Jubilee Memorial of the American Bible Society; being a Review of its First Fifty Years of Work, N.Y., 1867.

FERRY, Paul, b. at Metz, Feb. 24, 1591; d. there July 28, 1689; was pastor of the Reformed Congregation there for about sixty years. He was a very prolific writer; but most of his works still remain in manuscript, and those which have been printed are mediocre. He is noticeable, however, for his participation in the project of uniting the Protestants and Romanists of France. His correspondence with Bossuet on that occasion is found in vol. xxiv. of the works of the latter. His Lettre aux ministres de Genève, in defence of a poor lunatic who was burnt at Geneva for blasphemies against the Trinity, is found in vol. ii. of Bibliothèque Anglaise.

FERRY LAW, The, is the name generally applied to a law concerning public instruction, especially in the higher schools, which was laid before the Legislative Chamber of France, March 15, 1879, by Jules Ferry, at that time minister of public instruction, and passed by the Senate, July 19, same year. The tendency of this law is to exclude the influence of the Roman-Catholic Church from the school. Article VII. of the law, the centre of the debate, and the object of a very bitter contest, prohibits the member of a not recognized religious association to be the director of, or to teach in, a public school. In consequence of this article, twenty-seven Jesuit colleges were closed, and eight hundred Jesuit teachers were forbidden to work. But, besides the Jesuits, twenty-six other religious communities which could not obtain, or would not seek, the confirmation of the government, were affected by the law. See France, Ecclesiastical Statistics of.

FESCH, Joseph, b. at Ajaccio, Jan. 3, 1763; d. in Rome, May 13, 1839; was a younger stepbrother to Leititia, the mother of Napoleon I., and was educated for the church in the seminary
of the Jews. After the outbreak of the Revolution, he entered the military service, and accompanied his nephew on his first Italian campaign as an army commissary. He took part in the negotiation of the concordat, returned to the church, and was made Archbishop of Lyons in 1802, and Cardinal in 1803. As ambassador to Rome, he succeeded in inducing the Pope to go to Paris to crown Napoleon; and the day before the crowning, he gave to Napoleon and Josephine the consecration of the church. He was, however, not a mere tool in the hands of his nephew. He afterwards absolutely refused to annul the marriage which he had consecrated; and as president of the National Council assembled in Paris, 1810, he resisted the policy of Napoleon so persistently, that he entirely lost his favor. After the fall of the emperor, Cardinal Fesch sought refuge in Rome, and was very kindly received by the Pope. He joined Napoleon during the Hundred Days, but returned then to Rome, where he spent the rest of his life. His correspondence with Napoleon was published by Du Casse, in 3 vols., Paris, 1855. See Lyonnet: Le Cardinal Fesch, Lyons, 1841, 2 vols.; and La verite sur le Cardinal Fesch, Lyons, 1842.

FESTIVALS OF THE JEWS. The festivals of the Jews may be divided into pre-exilian and post-exilian. They will be found described under their respective titles.

I. The Pre-Exilian Festivals. — There are (a) The Seventh Day, or the Sabbath; (b) The Feast of Trumpets, or New Year; (c) The Day of Atonement; (d) The Feast of Tabernacles; and (e) The Feast of Pentecost. Besides, each seventh year was observed as a sabbatical, and, after seven times seven years, the Feast of Jubilee was observed.

II. The Post-Exilian Festivals. — After the exile, other holy seasons were added to those already enacted by Moses; thus the four fasts mentioned in Zechariah (for which comp. the art. Fasts), the Feast of Esther, the Triumphal entry of Christ on the first Thursday of Easter, and, finally, the Feast of the Dedication of the Temple on its restoration by Judas the Maccabee, and that of Wood Oflbrigg, on which see the Mishna Ta'am'lah, 3. 4. 2. 6.

The Seventh Day, or the Sabbath: (b) The Feast of Trumpets, or New Year; (c) The Day of Atonement. Besides, each seventh year was observed as a sabbatical, and, after seven times seven years, the Feast of Jubilee was observed.

The Seventh Day, or the Sabbath: (b) The Feast of Trumpets, or New Year; (c) The Day of Atonement. Besides, each seventh year was observed as a sabbatical, and, after seven times seven years, the Feast of Jubilee was observed.

The Feast of Tabernacles, and (e) The Feast of Pentecost. Besides, each seventh year was observed as a sabbatical, and, after seven times seven years, the Feast of Jubilee was observed.

The Seventh Day, or the Sabbath: (b) The Feast of Trumpets, or New Year; (c) The Day of Atonement. Besides, each seventh year was observed as a sabbatical, and, after seven times seven years, the Feast of Jubilee was observed.

The Seventh Day, or the Sabbath. As these festivals are treated separately, they will be found described under their respective titles.

The Seventh Day, or the Sabbath. As these festivals are treated separately, they will be found described under their respective titles.

The Seventh Day, or the Sabbath. As these festivals are treated separately, they will be found described under their respective titles.

The Seventh Day, or the Sabbath. As these festivals are treated separately, they will be found described under their respective titles.

The Seventh Day, or the Sabbath. As these festivals are treated separately, they will be found described under their respective titles.

The Seventh Day, or the Sabbath. As these festivals are treated separately, they will be found described under their respective titles.

The Seventh Day, or the Sabbath. As these festivals are treated separately, they will be found described under their respective titles.

The Seventh Day, or the Sabbath. As these festivals are treated separately, they will be found described under their respective titles.
cultures, he succeeded in re-establishing the old discipline and order among his monks. As a consequence of the reform, the reputation of the monastery increased so rapidly, that the envy excited, and Barrière was compelled to ask the confraternity of the reformed to meddle with the affairs of the monastery. Monks from Feuillans were invited to Rome; and monasteries on the reformed plan were founded in Rome, in Paris, and in Bordeaux. In 1586 the Pope entirely exempted the Feuillans from the authority of Cîteaux, and confirmed their constitution as an independent congregation. Under Henry IV. they obtained the right of electing their own general; and in the middle of the seventeenth century they numbered about thirty monasteries, with a total number of about five hundred inmates; a second, in 1599, at Toulouse; a third at Poitiers, in 1617, etc. See Joseph Morotius: Cisterciorum reformatiorum historia, Turin, 1690, fol. Don: de la Barrière, Paris, 1830, 2d ed., 8vo. ECKLER.

FEW, Ignatius A., D.D., L.L.D., b. in Augusta, Ga., April 11, 1789; d. in Athens, Ga., Nov. 28, 1845. After practising law for a few years, he was converted, and entered the ministry of the Methodist-Episcopal Church, 1828, and attained to great eminence. He was the founder and first president of Emory College, Oxford, Ga., and one of the leaders of the Methodist-Episcopal Church, South. His attainments, intellectual and spiritual, made him beloved and trusted.

FIACRE (Irish-Gaelic, raven or worth), d. 670; a saint of Irish parentage, and went to Meaux, in France, where he erected an oratory to the Virgin Mary, which became a famous resort for pilgrims. Of his life little is known. Miracles are attributed to him, and his relics were also preserved in his chapel; and, according to Boece (Hist. Scotland, ix. 10), "All women that gangis in his chapel will be other blind or mod [mad]." His name has been given to a carriage. In 1640 a merchant rented a building in Paris for his carriages, which he hired out. Over the building was an image of the saint, and the building itself was called "Hôtel de St. Fiacre." The name passed to the vehicles themselves. See Bolandist: Acta SS., Aug. 30, vol. vi. p. 604 sqq.; A. J. Ansart: Hist. de St. Fiacre, Paris, 1782; Smith: Dict. Christian and. Asia, 8th Ed., New York.

FICHTE, Johann Gottlieb, b. at Rammenau, in Upper Lusatia, May 19, 1762; d. in Berlin, Jan. 27, 1814; was educated at Schulpforta, and studied theology at Jena. The son of a poor ribbon-weaver, he was enabled to follow his intellectual ambition only by the aid of Baron von Militz; and, when his benefactor died, he led for several years a very precarious life as a tutor in Zürich and Warsaw, and as a student in Leipzig and Königsberg. He came out, however, from those years of poverty and embarrassments of all kinds, with a thorough training in sciences and a strong intellectual impression he received from the writings of Lessing. Afterwards, in course of his mental development, he successfully moved from the freethinking of Lessing to the determinism of Spinoza, and again from the determinism of Spinoza to the criticism of Kant. In Kant's limitation of causality to the world of phenomena he found the starting-point for his own philosophy,—that audacious deduction of both nature and God from the human ego, as to whose true character (atheism, or not) people still disagree. In 1794 he was appointed professor of philosophy at Jena; and the following year he published his chief work, Die Wissenschaftslehre (translated into English by A. E. Kroeger, Science of Knowledge, Philadelphia, 1868), and the beautiful essay, Uber die Bestimmung des Gelehrten (translated by W. Smith, The Vocation of the Scholar, in his Popular Writings of J. G. Fichte, 2 vols., London, 1848-49, new edition, 1871). Both his writings and his lectures made a deep impression on atheism. But a suspicion of atheism was already abroad; and when, in 1799, in a little essay, On the Grounds of our Faith in the Divine Government of the World, he declared that the moral order of the world is God, and that there is no other God, he was formally rebuked by the government, and discharged. The rest of his life he spent in Berlin, where he lectured to great audiences, and took an active part in the foundation of the university. The effect of his lectures (as, for instance, his Reden an die deutsche Nation), was felt through all Germany, and can still be felt at this very day. In these his later writings, as, for instance, in The Destination of Man, 1800 (translated by Mrs. Sinnett, London, 1846), The Nature of the Scholar, The Characteristics of the Present Age, The Way towards the Blessed Life, etc., 1805-07 (all translated by W. Smith in the book mentioned above), he took great pains to clear up his relation to religion, especially to Christianity. In some points he succeeds. It is evident that he was very far from considering Christianity a mere code of morality: he recognized it as an agency of much deeper significance in the history of the human race. But his incarnation, for instance, seems to have been to him nothing more than a typical representation of what takes place in every man when he is converted. Of the historical facts on which Christianity rests, he seems to have grasped the typical signification only. His collected works were edited (Bonn, 1844-46, 11 vols.), and his life was written, by his son, I. H. Fichte, Sulzbach, 1830, 2 vols., 2d ed., Leipzig, 1862.


FICHTE, Immanuel Hermann, the son of the former; b. at Jena, July 18, 1797; d. at Stuttgart, Aug. 13, 1879; was professor of philosophy at Bonn (1836-42), and at Tübingen (1842-75). He was a very prolific writer and a champion of Christian theism. In this respect...

FICINUS, Marsillus, b. at Florence, Oct. 19, 1433; d. in his villa, at Careggi, Oct. 1, 1499; was a son of the body-physician of Cosmo di Medici, and grew up in the palace, enjoying the instruction of Gemistus Pletio, and the intercourse of all the leaders of the Renaissance. In time he became one of the leaders himself; and he, more than any one else, was instrumental in familiarizing the age with the ideas of Plato and the Neo-Platonists. It was an enthusiastic conviction of his, that the depraved theolo...
courts. When the English governor arrived at the islands in 1875, they were in a state of almost hopeless poverty. A terrible pestilence had carried off, the year previous, one-third of the population. Mr. Cross had been laboring for eight, and Mr. Cargill for two years. The religion of the islands was a degrading superstition, and witchcraft was widely practised. The tribes were in a constant state of war with each other. The people wore no covering, except a kilt, four inches wide, around the waist. Their ornaments were limited to whale-teeth; but they took great pride in the dressing of their hair, which was so trained as to form a large bushy covering for the head; and so careful were they to protect it, that, in the place of pillows, they substituted a narrow yoke, one or two inches wide at the top, on which they rested their necks. Polygamy was practised, and the condition of woman was a very inferior one. The wife or wives were strangled at the death of the husband. Life was cheap, the kings sacrificing men at the launching of a new canoe, or the inception of a campaign, or the erection of a house. Cannibalism was also practised on a large scale, although there were some whom the missionaries found averse to eating human flesh. The victims of war, and shipwrecked mariners, were invariably served up on the table. The treatment of women has undergone a complete revolution; and the practice of cannibalism has been entirely given up (except among a few mountain tribes), under the influence of the missionaries.

The English Wesleyans were left in undisputed control of the islands until recently by the other Protestant churches. Messrs. Cross and Cargill were re-enforced by Messrs. Lythe and Hunt in 1839, and by Mr. Williams and others in 1840. The work was carried on amidst great discouragements and perils during the first years, but was richly rewarded with extensive revivals, and the gradual conversion of nearly the whole population. Thokombau, the chief king, after resisting the missionaries for a number of years, was baptized January, 1857, after having given up all his wives but one. The language was reduced to writing; and the Bible, Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress, a Fijian-English dictionary (by Rev. David Hazlewood), and other books, have been printed in the native language. There are at present fourteen hundred schools and nine hundred churches. Not only are the churches several thousand in number, but the people seem to be thoroughly in earnest. They have given up polygamy; and most of those who had many wives have put away all but one, and been legally married by the missionaries. The Sabbath is strictly observed, and family-worship scrupulously held. Mr. Cargill (quoting Miss Cumming in Sir Arthur Gordon’s family) says, “The first sound that greets your ears in the morning, and the last at night, is the sound of family worship in the village” (p. 86). The same writer, referring to the change that has taken place in the habits of the population, says, “I often wonder that some of the cavaliers who are forever sneering at Christian missions could see something of their results in these isles” (p. 86). See Williams, Fiji and the Fijians, and Calvert, Missionary Labors among the Cannibals, in 1 vol., 3d ed., Lond., 1870 (an interesting and exhaustive work); Lyton Forbes: Two Years in Fiji, Lond., 1875;

Miss Cumming: At Home in Fiji, Lond., 1881 (2 vols.), and N.Y., 1882 (1 vol.). D. S. Schaff.

Filioque Controversy. One of the principal differences between the Eastern and the Western Church is the addition by the latter of the word Filioque to its creed. The Apostles’ Creed has simply, “And in the Holy Ghost,” to which the Nicene Creed added, “Who proceedeth from the Father.” But there the Greek Church stopped; while the Latin Church, without the sanction of an ecumenical council, or even consultation with the Greek Church, until further added, “and the Son” (Filioque). The Greek Church protested as soon as it discovered the addition; and every attempt which afterwards was made to re-establish union between the two churches, has been wrecked on this word.

The addition is met with for the first time in the acts of the third council of Toledo (869), in opposition to Arianism. From Spain it spread into France, where it seems to have been generally adopted at the time of Charlemagne. The councils of Constantinople (861) and of Nicæa (787) did not notice it. But in 809 two monks from the court of Charlemagne made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and were accused of heresy by the hermits of Mount Olivet for their use of Filioque. Charlemagne felt provoked; and the council which he convoked at Aix-la-Chapelle (809) sanctioned the use of the addition.

But Pope Leo III., whose confirmation of the decision of the council was asked for by Charlemagne, refused to formally incorporate the Filioque with the Creed, though he admitted the justness and soundness of its doctrinal bearing; and this attitude of cautious reserve the Pope endeavored to maintain so far as he could under the pressure of the steadily-growing impatience of the East and the all but universal practice of the West. Towards the close of the century, however, this attitude became impossible. Photius, in his encyclical letter, emphasizes the Filioque as one of the gravest errors of the Pope; and the Council of Constantinople anathematized it. Political circumstances compelled the Pope to take up the challenge. Nevertheless, the first time a pope actually used the addition to the Creed was in 1014, by Benedict VIII., at the crowning of Henry IT. But from that moment the Pope himself appears as the defender of the practice of the Western Church, and at the Council of Ferrara-Florence he seemed to have entirely forgotten, that, at least historically, there was a flaw in his argument.

The doctrine in whose statement the word Filioque was destined to play so prominent a part is called the “Procession of the Holy Spirit.” The term comes from John xv. 26, in which Christ
speaks of the Spirit of truth who “proceedeth from the Father” (ἐξ ῥα τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπέμπεται). Inasmuch as nothing is said in this passage or in any other of the “double procession,” i.e., from both the Father and the Son, the Greek Church holds to the single procession, and defends its position, not only by an appeal to the text of Scripture and to the original form of the Nicene Creed, but also to the double processionon the grounds of the double physical processionof the Spirit from the Father alone, and the temporal mission of the Spirit from the Father and the Son (John xix. 26, xvi. 7). The former belongs to the trinity of essence, the latter of the trinity of revelation, and be due with the

The Latin Church defends the double procession on the grounds of the double mission of the Spirit and the essential unity of the Son with the Father; so that, if the Spirit proceed from the essence of the Father, he must also proceed from the essence of the Son, because they have the same essence. It distinguishes sharply between the eternal meta-
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FINLEY.

FINLEY, James Bradley, a distinguished pioneer of Methodism in Ohio; b. in North Carolina, July 1, 1781; d. at Cincinnati, Sept. 6, 1856. Joining the Ohio Conference in 1806, he was made presiding elder 1816. In 1821 he was sent to the Wyandotte Indians, whose labor was attended with much success. From 1845 to 1849 he was chaplain of the Ohio Penitentiary. He was a man of rugged eloquence and large influence. His chief works are Wyandotte Mission, Sketches of Western Methodism (Cincinnati, 1857), Life among the Indians (Cincinnati, 1857), Memoirs of Prison Life (Cincinnati, 1860).

Lit. — Autobiog. of J. B. Finley, Cincinnati, 1854; Stevens: Hist. of the Methodist-Episcopal Church, vol. iv.

FINLEY, Robert, D.D., a Presbyterian divine; b. in Princeton, 1772; d. at Athens, Ga., 1817. He graduated from Princeton College in his sixteenth year. After studying theology under Dr. Witherspoon, he became pastor at Basking Ridge, N.J., 1795. In 1803 a powerful revival was felt in his church, a hundred and twenty persons being admitted at one communion. He took a very prominent part in the organization of the Colonization Society (1816). In 1817 he accepted the presidency of the University of Georgia (Franklin College), located at Athens, where he died a few months after. Several of his sermons were published during his lifetime.


FINLEY, Samuel, D.D., a Presbyterian divine, and president of Princeton College; b. in Ireland, 1715; d. July 17, 1796. He came to America in 1744, and studied, so it is supposed, under Mr. Tennent in Log College. Licensed in 1740 by the presbytery of New Brunswick, he co-operated vigorously with the friends of revival preaching. In 1743 he was called to Milford, Conn., but was before many months expelled from the colony for preaching with much power. He at length took the pulpit of his own. In 1744 he was called to Nottingham, Md., where he established an academy which educated some prominent men. In 1761 he was chosen the successor of President Davies at Princeton College. Died and was buried in Philadelphia. Several of Dr. Finley's sermons were published during his lifetime, the principal of which were one on Matt. xii. 28, Christ triumphing, and Satan raging (1741), and The Curse of Easter. See Bede: Hist. Eccl., iii. 21-25.

FINNEY, Charles G., a powerful revivalist preacher, and president of Oberlin College; was b. at Warren, Litchfield County, Conn., Aug. 29, 1792; d. at Oberlin, O., Aug. 16, 1875. When he was only two years old, his parents removed to Western New York. This placed him beyond the reach of anything more than a common-school education. At seventeen he began to teach, and in 1818 to study law at Adams, in Western New York. Neither of his parents was a church-member, nor did he up to his twentieth year enjoy any but the most meagre opportunities of hearing the gospel. His conversion in 1821 was remarkable for its suddenness, thoroughness, and the definitely marked stages of his experience. Feeling an immediate call to preach, he forsook the law, held prayer-meetings, was received under care of presbytery (1822), and licensed to preach 1824. He at once turned his attention to revival labors, which were continued, with few interruptions, until 1860, when he was forced to give up the work of an itinerant evangelist on account of age. These labors, beginning in Western and Central New York, were extended to Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and other cities of the East, and reached to England, which Mr. Finney visited in 1849 and 1858, preaching with much power. In 1852 he accepted a call to the pastorate of the Second Free Church of New-York City, and, two years later, another to the recently organized Congregational Church known as the Broadway Tabernacle. In 1855 he went to Oberlin as professor, where he continued to labor till the time of his death as instructor of theology, pastor, and college president (1862). During his residence at Oberlin he still continued, as before, to hold revival meetings in Eastern cities until 1860.

Mr. Finney's career naturally falls under the two heads of revivalist preacher and theological teacher. His power as a preacher was very great; and his labors produced, in many places, wonderful effects. Wherever he went, extensive revivals prevailed. His manner was vigorous, direct, and personal. He used simple language and illustrations. His presentation was clear, and strictly logical. He directed his appeal to the conscience, rather than the affections, and made it tremble and quake by the most searching analysis of the motives of the heart. On one occasion he says, "Everybody was out at meeting, and the Lord let me loose upon them in a wonderful manner" (Autobiog., p. 100). He chose for themes those passages which delineate the sinner's condition as one of conscious alienation from God, and sinning against him. He dwelt upon the enmity of the carnal mind, the want of holiness, and the certain destruction of the impenitent. He called upon his hearers to come to an immediate decision, and submit to God. "Instead of telling sinners," he says, "to use the means of grace, and pray for a new heart, I called on them to make themselves a new heart and spirit, and pressed the duty of immediate surrender to God" (Autobiog., p. 189). These meetings were often accompanied by violent bodily manifestations; and Mr. Finney practised the methods of calling upon the audiences to go forward to the anxious-bench, or to rise in attestation of new resolutions. These attendant circumstances, and Mr. Finney's methods of preaching, early evoked criticism and strong...
opposition. Mr. Nettleton and Dr. Beecher were among the opponents of the "new measures;" and a convention was held in July, 1827, at New Lebanon, of prominent ministers (such as Dr. Hawes of Hartford, Edwards of Andover, Beecher of Boston, Beman of Troy, etc.), to take the whole matter into consideration. However, with better information, the opposition decreased. Mr. Finney's preaching reached all classes; lawyers and educated men being particularly convinced by it, as notably at Rochester.

As a teacher at Oberlin, Mr. Finney's influence was also great. He was an original thinker, and very positive in his convictions. His lectures on theology define his position as a theologian. It is here not necessary to do more than merely state some of the main and distinguishing views. He held to the plenary ability of the sinner to repent, regarded happiness as the chief aim, and explained regeneration (which he did not clearly distinguish from conversion) to consist of an act of the will, rather than an act of the Holy Spirit. He exerted a shaping influence over the minds of his students; and his theology, in a modified form, had a wide acceptance in his own denomination in the West.

LET. — Mr. Finney's works are: Lectures on Revivals, Oberlin, 1858; passed through many editions (new and enlarged edition, Oberlin, 1868); Lectures to Professing Christians, Oberlin, 1836; Sermons on Important Subjects, New York, 1839; Lectures on Theology, Oberlin, 1846, new ed., 1878, republished in London. See, for a criticism upon Mr. Finney's theology, Dr. Hodge, in Princeton Review, April, 1847; for his life, Memoirs of Charles G. Finney, being an Autobiography, New York, 1870. D. S. SCHAFF.

FINTAN, a native of Leinster, Ireland; was carried off by a swarm of marauding Northmen, but escaped, and spent two years on the coast of Caithness with a bishop; went thence to Rome, from Rome to Switzerland, where he entered the monastery of Rheingaw, or Rheinau, in the canton of Zürich, as a monk. In 800 he retired from the monastery, and lived to his death (in 827) as a hermit in the neighborhood, practising the most austere asceticism. He was venerated as a saint, even during his lifetime; and after his death his remains were to be presented in the temple when one month old, and were to be redeemed according to the estimation of the priest (Exod. xiiii. 18; Num. xviii. 16 sq.). The orthodox Jews still observe this law of redemption, with this difference, that the rabbi takes the place of the priest, who, having received the price of redemption, swells it round the head of the infant, in token of his vicarious authority, saying, "This is for the first-born, this is in lieu of it, this redeems it; and let this son be spared for life, for the law of God, and for the fear of Heaven. May it please thee, that, as he was spared for redemption, so he may be spared for the law, for marriage, and for good works. Amen." The rabbi lays his hand upon the child's head, and blesses it, as follows: "The Lord make thee as Ephraim and Manasseh." When the first-born son is thirteen years of age, he fasts the day before the Feast of Passover. The redemption of the first-born of animals seems to have wholly disappeared after the destruction of the temple. The first-born of unclean animals, when it was twenty two days old, was to be redeemed according to the valuation of the priest, with the addition of one-fifth of the value, and then remain with the owner, or be sold, and the price given to the priest (Lev. xxvii. 11—13). The first-born of any clean animal, from eight days to twelve months, provided it had no blemish, had to be taken to Jerusalem, and delivered to the priest, who offered it as a sacrifice to Jehovah, sprinkled its blood upon the altar, burned the flesh and ate the flesh (Num. xvi. 15—17); but, if it had any blemish, it was not to be sacrificed, but eaten up at home, whilst the blood was to be poured upon the ground (Deut. xv. 19—23). As among most nations, the male first-born among the Israelites enjoyed special prerogatives over the younger brethren, as is indicated in the Old Testament (comp. Gen. xlii. 3; 2 Chron. xxii. 3). W. PRESSL (B. PICE).
that a feeling of gratitude toward the Giver of all good was shown by the first men in offering the first-fruits, or the first and best which they felt was afterwards regulated among the first-fruit offerings. (a) On the mor-

HEBREWS by the Mosaic law, which ordained the first-fruits of Nisan) a sheaf of new corn was to be brought to the priest, and waved before the altar. This offering was accompanied by a lamb as sacrifice, two tenth-deals of flour, and a drink offering of a fourth part of a hin of wine (Exod. xxix. 39 sq.; Lev. xxiii. 9 sq.). (b) Seven weeks from this time (i.e., at the Feast of Pentecost), an oblation was to be made of two loaves made of two tenth-deals of flour. They were accompanied by a bone of an ass, one green ear of wheat, one new wine, and two rams, a meat and drink offering, a sin offering of one kid of the goats, and two lambs for a peace offering, which were waved with the loaves, but afterwards belonged to the priests (Lev. xxiii: 17 sq.). (c) The Feast of Ingather-

ing (i.e., the Feast of Tabernacles), in the seventh month, was itself an acknowledgment of the fruits of the harvest (Exod. xxxiv. 22; Lev. xxiii. 39).

Besides these stated occasions, every Israelite was to consecrate to the Lord a part of the first-fruit of the land; as of oil, honey, dough, wool,—in fact, of every thing. The fruits of every newly-planted tree were not to be eaten or sold, or used in any way for the first three years, but considered "uncircumcised," or unclean. In the fourth year, however, the first-fruits were to be consecrated to the Lord, and in the fifth year became available to the owner (Lev. xix. 23 sq.). As the quantity of these offerings was not fixed by the law, but was left to the good will of the individual (Deut. xvi. 10), tradition has laid down rules and regulations, with such minuteness as only rabbins in is capable of; and the Tal-
mudic treatises Bikkurim and Terumah (cf. art. Talmod) are especially full on this matter. For a description of a Biccurim procession, see De-


FIRST-FRUTS, ECCLESIASTICAL. See TAXES, ECCLESIASTICAL.

FISCH, George, D.D., b. at Nyon, Canton de Vaud, Switzerland, July 6, 1814; d. at Vallorbes, Switzerland, Sunday, July 3, 1881. He studied theology at Lausanne, and was for five years pastor of a small German church at Vevey; but in 1845 entered the Baptist ministry, and after a five-years' pastorate at Somerville, N.J., came to the First Baptist Church of Newark, 1850, and was its pastor when he died. He was remarkably gifted, and used his powers to the utmost. Twice he visited the United States (in 1861 and in 1873), during the last time as a delegate to the Evangelical Alliance Conference held in New York, Oct. 2–12. He was also a delegate to the First Council of the Presbyterian Alliance in Edinburgh, July 3–10, 1877.

FISHER, Henry Clay, b. at Halifax, Vt., Jan. 27, 1820; d. in Newark, N.J., Oct. 2, 1877. He was graduated from Union Seminary, New York, in 1845; entered the Baptist ministry, and after a five-years' pastorate at Somerville, N.J., came to the First Baptist Church of Newark, 1850, and was its pastor when he died. He was very successful, attracting large audiences, and making a profound impression. He was an ardent and efficient worker in extending the Baptist Church. Notwithstanding his devoted pastoral labors, he found time to prepare several meritorious works: Primi-
tive Piety Revived, Boston, 1855 (20,000 copies sold in two years); Pulpit Eloquence, N.Y., 1856, 2 vols., new ed. in 1 vol., 1877; Pulpit Eloquence of the Nineteenth Century, N.Y., 1857, new ed., 1875; Select Discourses from the German and French, N.Y., 1858; Heaven in Song, N.Y., 1874 (a poetical compila-
tion); Handbook of Revivals, Boston, 1874; Bible Lands, Hartford, 1876 (based upon his visit in 1874).
was sent to the Tower. The Pope sent him a cardinal's hat to protect him; but this served only to exasperate the king, by whose orders he was executed.


FLACIUS (VLACICH), Matthias, b. March 3, 1520, at Albona in Istria (hence the surname Illyricus); d. at Francfort, March 11, 1575; was very early sent to Venice to study ancient languages, and was about to enter a monastery and become a monk; when, through the intercession of his father, cardinal Lurtonius, provincial of the Minorites, advised him to go to Germany, and study theology there. He visited first Basel (1539), then Augsburg, and came in 1541 to Wittenberg, where he was kindly received by Luther and Melanchthon; and in 1544 was appointed professor in Hebrew. He also lectured on the Epistles of Paul and on Aristotle: but his activity was suddenly interrupted by the outbreak of the Smalcaldian war. He fled to Brunswick, where he lived by teaching school; but, though he was recalled by the elector Maurice, the establishment of the Leipzig Interim drove him away again, and he settled at Magdeburg (1549), where printing and publication were still free. The literary activity he there developed against the Interim, in the adiaphoristic controversy and in the Osianischer, Schwenkfelder, and Major controversies, was very comprehensive, and of great influence: but it placed him in direct opposition to Melanchthon. And when, in 1557, he was appointed professor at Jena, together with Musaeus and Wigand, Jena became the headquarters of the strict Lutheran party, as Wittenberg was that of the Philippists. In the beginning he exercised the office of the dean of the city, and was about to enter a monastery and become a monk; when, through the intercession of his old friends from Jena, immediately made the basis for an accusation of heresy, and in 1561 he was condemned by the synod of Dort (1618, 1619) in answer to the Five Articles of the Arminians or Remonstrants, put forth in 1610. They are particular predestination, limited atonement, inability, irresistible grace, and the perseverance of saints. The best special discussions of the Five Points are by Whitby (Lond., 1710) on the Arminian side, and Gill (Cause of God and Truth, 4 vols., London, 1735-38) and Jonathan Dickinson (Philadelphia, 1741) on the Calvinistic. See ARMINIANISM and CALVINISM.

PLACIUS, a theological term indicating the five characteristic tenets of Calvinism as opposed to Arminianism. They were defended by the synod of Dort (1618, 1619) in answer to the Five Articles of the Arminians or Remonstrants, put forth in 1610. They are particular predestination, limited atonement, inability, irresistible grace, and the perseverance of saints. The best special discussions of the Five Points are by Whitby (Lond., 1710) on the Arminian side, and Gill (Cause of God and Truth, 4 vols., London, 1735-38) and Jonathan Dickinson (Philadelphia, 1741) on the Calvinistic. See ARMINIANISM and CALVINISM.
FLAGELLANTS.

That there was something narrow and exclusive in his stand-point... cannot be denied. The sad fate which overtook him may not have been altogether undeserved. But the great ability of the man, and the fundamental integrity of his character, are proven by his brilliant scientific performances,—the Catalogus testium veritatis, answering the Romanist's objection to the Reformation as a mere innovation; the Magdeburg Centuries, of which Flaccius was the originator and leading spirit (see Centuries, Magdeburg); and the Clavis scripture sacræ, the basis of biblical hermeneutics.

The antipathy which for centuries has clung to his name is unjust. W. Preger has recently vindicated his memory by his excellent work, Matthias Flaccius Illyricus und seine Zeit, Erlangen, 1859-61. [See also J. W. Schulte, Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte d. Magdeburger Centurien, Niesse, 1877.]

FLAGELLANTS (Flagellantes), Brothers of the Cross (crucifrates), Crossbearers (cruciferi), Brothers in White (in albis), and Independents (acephali), because they had broken with the hierarchy, are the names of morbid fanatics from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century. The prelude to the Flagellant pilgrimages was the fraternity brought into life by the preaching of Anthony of Padua (about 1210). The men composing it went about in large bodies, singing, and scourging themselves. In 1260-61 many of the inhabitants of the Guelph city of Perugia began suddenly, as if vehemently moved by a mighty spirit of repentance, to flagellate themselves with leather thongs. High and low, old and young, went together in procession two and two, with bodies bare above the waist, through the streets. Their numbers increased like an avalanche. Some marched through Lombardy to Provence; others went to Rome. The Pope did not molest them, as they did not resist the ecclesiastical authorities; and a perceptible improvement in morals, the reconciliation of enemies, and generous gifts of alms, attested the sincerity of their penance.

In Italy the enthusiasm soon cooled; but beyond the Alps it broke out afresh, and in 1291 large bodies of Flagellants appeared in France, Burgundy, Belgium, Alsace, the Upper Rhine country, Austria, Bohemia, and Poland. They marched two or three abreast, with body bare above the waist, and face veiled. They were preceded by flags or crosses, and flagellated themselves twice a day for thirty-three days, in memory of the thirty-three years of our Lord's life. They accompanied the strokes of the scourge with the music of hymns (among which was the Stabat Mater of Jacopone da Todi). At first priests were found in the ranks. But the Flagellants soon came to be accused of opposing the hierarchy; and the clergy not only separated themselves from their company, but preached against them, and persecuted them, so that by the end of the year hardly a vestige was left in Germany of their existence.

The movement was at its height in the fourteenth century. They made their first appearance in Italy, and impetus was given by the terrible plague which in 1347-49 ran through Europe, carrying off 60,000 people in Florence, 100,000 in Venice, 1,200,000 in Germany, not to mention other cities and lands. While many gave full sway to their passions, and some sat down in despair, others gave themselves up to self-inflicted flagellations, in the hope of appeasing the divine anger, and with the purpose of preparing for the end of the world, which they regarded as being near at hand. On the 17th of April, 1349, the first Flagellant fraternity appeared in Magdeburg. This was quickly followed by others in Würzburg, Speier, and Strassburg. They were regarded with awe on all sides; and the movement spread throughout all Germany, and extended to Denmark and England. Women were also found in the ranks. There was a regular organization, and conditions of membership. The candidate had to have the permission of his wife, promise obedience, have at least four shillings and fourpence to defray expenses, as begging was prohibited, etc. When they came to towns, the bands marched in regular military order, and singing hymns. At the time of flagellation they selected a square, or churchyard, or field. Taking off all their clothes and forming a circle, they girded themselves with aprons, and laid down flat on the ground. The particular position or gesture of each signified his chief sin. ("They fell on their back, side, or belly, according to the nature of their sin" (Chron. Thuring.).) The leader, then stepping over each one, touched them with the whip, and bade them rise. As each was touched, they followed after the leader, and imitated him. Once all on their feet, the flagellation began. The brethren went two by two around the whole circle, striking their backs till the blood trickled down from the wounds. The whip consisted of three thongs, each with four iron teeth. During the flagellation a hymn was sung. After all had gone around the circle, the whole body again fell on the ground, beating upon their breasts. On arising they flagellated themselves a second time. While the brethren were putting on their clothes, a collection was taken up among the audience. The scene was concluded by the reading of a letter from Christ which an angel had brought to earth, and which commended the pilgrimages of the Flagellants. The fraternities never tarried longer than a single day in a town. Though Bava Hiera, Saxony, the Upper Rhine country, Austria, Bohemia, and Poland,...
FLAVEL.
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garments which covered the head, and had only two holes for the eyes. Priests and bishops joined them. But in 1399 Boniface IX. had one of their number executed, and the fanaticism disappeared. The Council of Constance took the matter under discussion [and Gerson wrote a treatise against them, "Contra Sectum Flagellantum." Flagellating fraternities existed in France in the sixteenth century, were used by Henry III., and suppressed by Henry IV. [So late as 1820 a procession of Flagellants passed through the streets of Lisbon.]


FLAVEL, John, an eminent English Nonconformist divine, the son of a minister; b. in Worcestershire about 1627; d. in Exeter, June 26, 1691. He was educated at Oxford, and became curate of Deptford. From there he went to Dartmouth in 1656. By the Act of Uniformity he was deprived of his living, with two thousand pounds to the other, and retired to Hudscott Hall, in Devonshire, where he was liberally supported by the lord of the domain. He preached privately in the woods and remote places, until, at the expiration of the Stuarts, he returned to Dartmouth, and labored as pastor of the Nonconformist Church. Flavel was a prolific writer on practical religion; and some of his works are eminently adapted to stimulate piety. His principal works are: "Husbandry Spiritualized: The Fountain of Life Opened up (in forty-two sermons); The Soul of God revealed (in thirty-two sermons); The Christian's Dictionary, etc."

Complete editions of his works, London, 1691, 2 vols., at Nîmes, 1782. His life was written by T. Nelson, 1773, in 10 vols., at Nîmes, 1782. His life was written by A. Delacroix, Paris, 1805, 2 vols.

FLEETWOOD, John, the name, probably assumed, under which a Life of Christ, Lives of the Apostles, John the Baptist, and the Virgin Mary, usually found together, were issued. These have very frequently been printed. Before the modern elaborate Lives of Christ, which are far superior in point of scholarship, appeared, Fleetwood's was almost the only one found in Christian families. Two other volumes, The Christian Prayer Book, London, 1772, and The Christian's Dictionary, 1773, are attributed to him.

FLEETWOOD, William, a learned English prelate; b. in London, Jan. 21, 1650; d. at Tottenham, Middlesex, Aug. 4, 1723. He was educated at Cambridge; became Canon of Windsor 1702, Bishop of St. Asaph 1706, and of Ely 1714. He was one of the most eloquent preachers of his day. A complete collection of his Sermons, Tracts, etc., appeared at London, 1737; Complete Works, 3 vols., Oxford, 1854.

FLESH (σάρξ) Biblical Meaning of. The Bible has different representations of man's material nature. The term "flesh" is always used with reference to man's body; so that Chrysostom's comment on Gal. v. 16 is anything but precise, — "The flesh (σάρξ) is not the body, nor the essence of the body, but the evil disposition, the earthly, lustful, and lawless reason." The same is true of Julius Müller's definition, — "The flesh is the tendency or inclination of human life turned away from God, the life and movement of man in the midst of the things of this visible world." The flesh is regarded as being endowed with evil desires, not a tendency of the will, but as a disposition of the will. As σάρξ ("world") designates, not a tendency of the world hostile to God, but the world with that tendency, so σάρξ ("flesh") designates, not a tendency or
disposition of the flesh, but the flesh itself with that disposition.

Flesh is the substance of the body. It is sometimes used with the bones, as constituting the body (Luke xxiv. 39), or with blood (1 Cor. xv. 50). By synecdoche it is used for the body (Ps. xvi. 9; 2 Cor. x. 3). This use of the term is a Hebrew idiom (Chrysostom and Müller), as above quoted.

2 Cor. x. 3). This use of the term is a Hebrew idiom (Chrysostom and Müller), as above quoted.

The expression "the body "a body of the flesh," aqua rig aapxég as weak (Matt. xxvi. 41) and sinful in contrast to God (Deut. xii. 20).

Flesh also indicates the peculiarity of man's visible or tangible nature. Thus it is opposed to πνεῦμα, or spirit (Col. ii. 1, 5); and a distinguishing characteristic of the earthly life is that it is a "life in the flesh" (Phil. i. 22). To boast of the flesh means to build on man's visible nature. The expression "The Word was made flesh" (John i. 14) gets its force from the contrast with (ver. 1) "The Word was God." The same contrast is brought out in Ps. i. 5, 2 Chron. xxxii. 8, 2 Cor. xiii. 4. The flesh then designates human nature as weak (Matt. xxvi. 41) and sinful in contrast to God.

The sinfulness of the flesh is specially brought out by Paul (Rom. vii. 9). In this sense he calls the body "a body of the flesh," σώμα τῆς σαρκός (Col. ii. 11), and life a "walking in the flesh" (2 Cor. x. 3). But sinful flesh is not a disposition (Chrysostom and Müller), as above quoted, nor is it sufficient, with Neander, to define it as "human nature in its alienation from God," nor, with Holsten, to describe it as essentially finite and evil, so that in the Pauline theology sin was a necessity. The flesh is only the substance of the body, the seat of sin, but not essentially evil, it is man's human or bodily nature, as Hofmann says (Schriftenwerke, i. 539), in the state in which it was left after the fall.

The flesh contains the germ of physical life (John i. 13, iii. 6); it is the essence: the body is the form. Sin now inheres in the flesh, and therefore all who are sons of Adam are sinners, because he was a sinner; and he who overcomes the flesh overcomes it by a conflict between the σώμα ("mind") and the flesh, and thereby overcomes sin. Christ entered into the flesh with all the consequences of sin or the fall (Col. i. 22; Heb. ii. 14); but his own spiritual nature overcame, so to speak, at the very beginning, its disposition to sin.

neighboring ringing a bell, that no one might be able to give as an excuse for non-attendance at church that he did not awake early enough. Now he appeared suddenly at vulgar entertainments, and with Knox-like fearlessness preached to the astounded revellers upon the folly of forbidden pleasures. "Those sinners," says John Wesley, "that tried to hide themselves from him, he pursued to every corner of his parish by all sorts of means, public and private, early and late," etc. Great and blessed results necessarily followed from such fidelity. In 1768 he was called to preside over Lady Huntington's College at Trevecca, Wales. He accepted the position, but did not leave his parish. Disagreements with the authorities on points of doctrine led him to resign in 1771, but no unpleasantness was connected with the resignation.

As a preacher, Fletcher directed his appeals to the conscience. He was well trained, and had a fine voice. J. Wesley said, that, if he had had physical strength, he would have been the most eloquent preacher in England. As a man, he was characterized by saintly piety, rare devotion to God, and blamelessness of life, which Wesley said he had not found equalled in Europe or America. In the judgment of Southey, "no age ever produced a man of more fervent piety, or more perfect charity, and no church ever possessed a more apostolic minister;" and, according to Bishop Ryle, "his devotion has been equalled by few, and probably surpassed by none."

In theology, Fletcher was an Arminian of Arminians. Most of his writings are directed against Calvinism, were written to defend Mr. Wesley, and grew out of controversies with Toplady and Mr. Rowland Hill. Some of these works are still extensively circulated, and are authorities in the Methodist churches. However, controversial as his writings are, Fletcher was not a polemic, but always treated his opponents with fairness and courtesy, and in this presented a marked contrast to Toplady. He was also a millenarian (see his letter to John Wesley, Nov. 28, 1755).
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FLEURY. A town with a celebrated abbey (Floriacum), situated in the diocese of Orléans, on the right bank of the Loire, and founded by Leodebad, Abbot of St. Aniane, in the first years of the reign of Chloderic II., 688–697. When the Lombards destroyed Monte Cassino, Abbot Mummolus sent the monk Aigulf to Italy in order to bring the remains of St. Benedict to Fleury. The expedition succeeded; and the relics worked so many miracles, that the report of them filled four big volumes (Floriacensis vetus bibliotheca Benedictina, etc., Opera Joannis a Bosco., Lugduni, 1805); and Fleury became, as it were, caput ac primus omnium cannobiorum. The Danes visited the place thrice. The first time the monks fled, and the Vikings plundered the abbey; the second time the marauders were defeated and repulsed by the monks; and the third time St. Benedict himself appeared in person, and the heathen barbarians were converted to Christianity. He came to St. Odo, towards the close of the ninth century, the abbey rose to still greater distinction. Its library was one of the richest in the realm, and its school had at one time five thousand pupils; but it never produced any great scholars. During the Huguenot wars it suffered so much, that it lost its independence, and joined the Congregation of St. Maur.

FLEURY, Claude, b. in Paris, Dec. 6, 1640; d. there July 14, 1723; was educated by the Jesuits at Clermont; studied law in Paris, and practised as an advocate for nine years, but changed his career, was ordained priest in 1672, and lived from that time till his death at the court, as tutor, first to the Prince of Conti, then to the Count of Vermandois, and finally to the Dukes of Burgundy, Anjou, and Berry, and as confessor to Louis XV. (1716–22). He was an ardent student and a prolific writer. He was made Abbé of Loc-Dieu (1694), member of the Academy (1696), prior of Argenteuil (1708), when he resigned his abbacy, and was throughout a friend of Fénelon. The results of his juridical studies came out in his Histoire du droit français (Paris, 1674, last ed., 1822) and Institution au droit ecclésiastique (1692, often republished). In 1691 he wrote Les maures des Israelites (1816, Eng. trans., Lond., 1756, 2d ed., enlarged, by Adam Clarke, Manchester, 1805, and New York, 1880), Les maures des Christens (1802, last ed., 1810, trans. Newcastle, 1786), and several other historical sketches of a pedagogical tendency. But his principal work is his Histoire ecclésiastique (Paris, 1801 sqq. 20 vols., extending to 1814), but continued to 1584 by Claude Fabre, in 16 vols., 1732–38, with 4 vols. of indexes, 40 vols. in all), a work of considerable merit, designed for the educated public in general, and still read with satisfaction. Eng. trans. to 970, Lond., 1727–32, 5 vols.; and by Cardinal Newman, with notes, from the Second (Ecumenical Council (381) to 456, Oxford, 1842–44, 3 vols.). Of his minor works, Emery gave a collected edition, Opuscules de l’abbé Fleury, Paris, 1807.
indefatigable zeal, fervent piety, and rare talent of organization. Left an orphan at the age of thirteen, he studied at Giessen, Göttingen, and Heidelberg, and for a further period of education at Cologne, and began to doubt his fitness for the ministry, when he received and accepted, in November, 1821, what he considered a providential call, with the promise of a salary of a hundred and eighty Prussian dollars, from a small Protestant colony at Kaiserswerth, a Roman-Catholic town of eighteen hundred inhabitants, on the Lower Rhine, below Düsseldorf. The failure of a silk manufactory, upon which the town depended largely for support, led him to undertake, in the spring of 1822, a collecting tour to keep his struggling congregation alive. By the end of a week he returned with twelve hundred thalers. This was the beginning of much greater things. By experience and perseverance he became one of the greatest benefactors of the service of Christ. In the year 1823 he made a tour to Holland and England, which not only resulted in a permanent endowment of his congregation, but suggested to him the idea of his benevolent institutions. "In both these Protestant countries," he tells us himself, "I became acquainted with a multitude of charitable institutions for the benefit both of body and soul. I saw schools and other educational organizations, almshouses, orphanages, hospitals, prisons, and societies for the reformation of prisoners, Bible and mission societies, etc.; and at the same time I observed that it was a living faith in Christ which had called almost every one of these institutions and societies into life, and still preserved them in activity. This evidence of the practical power and fertility of such a principle had a most powerful influence in strengthening my own faith."

Fliedner made two more journeys to Holland, England, and Scotland (in 1824 and 1853), in the interest no more of his congregation, but of his institutions. He also visited the United States in 1849. Twice he travelled to the East,—in 1851 to aid Bishop Gobat in founding a house of deaconesses in Jerusalem, and again in 1857, when he was, however, too feeble to proceed farther than Jaffa. King Frederick William IV. of Prussia and his Queen Elizabeth took the most cordial interest in his labors for the sick and poor, granted him several audiences, furnished him liberally with means, and founded a Christian hospital, with deaconesses at Berlin (Bethany) after the model of Kaiserswerth. In the parsonage garden at Kaiserswerth there still stands the little summer-house, with one room of ten feet square, and an attic over it, which was the first asylum for released female prisoners, and the humble cradle of all Fliedner’s institutions, the most important of which is the institution of Evangelical Deaconesses, founded in 1838 on the basis of the apostolic precedent, and with some resemblance to the catholic sisterhoods of charity, but without binding vows. At his death the number of deaconesses in connection with Kaiserswerth and its branch establishments exceeded four hundred. In 1873 there were thirty-four houses, with over seventeen hundred nursing and teaching sisters; in 1878 the number of inmates, sailors, and nurses, in England, France, Scandinavia, Russia, and Austria, rose to fifty-two, and the number of sisters to nearly four thousand, who labored on eleven hundred stations.

FLOOD. See NOAH.

FLORE, The Order of (Florianenses, or Florencenses, to be distinguished from Floriacum, the Latin name of the abbey of Flevigli), was founded by Joachim, Abbot of Flore (Fiore), in Calabria (1111–30); which article see. The constitution of the order was confirmed by Celestine III. (1196), and its houses were richly endowed by Henry VI. and his wife Constantia. It spread rapidly, and numbered many monasteries, not only in Calabria, but throughout Italy. Originally it rose as a branch of the Cistercian order; but its rules were more severe, and this circumstance gave Gregory IX. occasion to forbid the Cistercians to receive any Floriacensian into their order. The Cistercians became infuriated at this slight, and did their utmost to ruin the privileged rival: they finally succeeded. In the beginning of the sixteenth century the order of Flore disappeared. Most of the members joined the Cistercians; others, the Carthusians or the Dominicans. See HELOT, Histoire des ordres monastiques, Paris, 1714–19, 8 vols.

FLORENC, Council of. See FERRARA-FLORENCE, Council of.

FLORIAN, a martyr, and a saint in the Roman-Catholic Church, whose day falls on March 4. He was a soldier in the army of Diocletian (284–305), and was drowned in the Enns, in Austria, and confessed the Christian faith. On the spot where his corpse drifted ashore, a magnificent monastery was afterwards built. But his remains were brought to Rome, where they rested until 1183, when Pope Lucius III. presented them to King Casimir of Poland. Thus St. Florian became the patron saint of Poland.

FLORUS (not Drepanius, surnamed Magister, on account of his great learning; or Diaconus, from
his ecclesiastical position), lived at Lyons in the ninth century, and took a prominent part in the
dogmatical controversies of his time. A decided
adversary of Paschius Radbertus's doctrine of
transubstantiation, he taught that there is no
direct and active participation in the body and blood
of Christ than that through faith, and calls the bread
the mystical body of the Lord. See his Expositio
in Canon. Missar, written before 834, and first
printed in Paris, 1548, though without his name.
In the controversy concerning predestination he
wrote his Liber adversus Joh. Scoti errores de
finitiones (852) and Sermo de predestinatione, though
without fully adopting the ideas of Gottschalk.
He was present at the first synod convened in the
case by Hincmar, at Chiersy, 849. In the con-
troversy between Agobard and Amalarius he wrote a
number of passionate letters, which made much
noise in their time. They are found in Bibl. Patr.
Max., XV., and, together with his other essays,
in Migne, Patro. Lat., 119. His most compre-
hesive work, a commentary on the Epistles of
Paul, is a mere compilation from Augustinian. It
was formerly ascribed to Bede, and is found in the
Basel and Cologne editions of his works; but
Florus's authorship has been conclusively proved
by Mabillon. [F. Maasen: Ein Commentar des
Florus von Lyon zu einigen d. sogenannten Sirmond-
ischen Constitutionen, Wien, 1879.]

G. Plitt.

Florus, Gesius, succeeded Albinus in 64
A.D. as Roman governor of Judea, and caused
his rapine and tyranny that insurrection which
led to the destruction of the the temple in Jeru-
salem, and the annihilation of the national inde-
pendence of the Jews. What finally became of
Florus himself is not known; but vivid descrip-
tions of his nefarious rule in Judea are found in
Josephus (Antiq., XX. 9, and De Bello Jud., II.
24, 25) and in Tacitus (Hist., V. 10).

Flüe, Nikolaus von, generally known under the
name of Bruder Klaus, was b. at Flueli, in the
canton of Unterwalden, Switzerland, March 21,
1417; and d. in his hermit's cell at Ranft, close
by his native place, March 21, 1487. He grew up
without receiving any other education than that
which naturally resulted from active participation
in the business of the home. Nevertheless, he
served his country well, both in the army and as
a judge. In 1450 he married. He had ten chil-
dren in seventeen years; and he was known as
an energetic, prudent, and tender house-father.
Nevertheless the whole bent of his nature was
towards a life of seclusion and devout contempla-
tion. From early youth he practised a severe
asceticism; and Oct. 16, 1467, he actually retired
from his home and family, and settled in a lonely
place up among the Alps, where he built a cell, and
spent the rest of his life. To the great esteem
and reverence which all who knew him felt for
him, was soon added a tinge of the miraculous.
People told of him that he never ate. Pilgrim-
ages were made to his cell. Everybody wanted
his example, but in numerous special cases by his
exhortations or warnings. At the diet of Stanz
(1481) he actually saved the confederation from
civil war, and brought about an agreement on
that constitution under which Switzerland lived
until the close of the eighteenth century. After
his death, his countrymen made the greatest exer-
tions to have him canonized. But a canonization
is a very expensive affair; and in spite of sub-
scriptions, heavy taxes, etc., nothing more than a
beatiication could be obtained from Clement
IX., 1669.

Litr. — The literature concerning Bruder Klaus
is very great. A complete list of it may be found
in E. L. Rochholz, Schweizerl. der von B. K.,
Aarau, 1875, pp. 255–309. The best biography
of him is that by Jons. Ming, 3 vols., Luzern,
1861–71.

Fonseca, Pedro da, b. at Cortiza, Portugal,
1528; d. at Coimbra, Nov. 4, 1599; entered
the order of Jesus in 1548; studied at Evora,
and became professor at Coimbra. Among his
works are a Latin commentary on the meta-
physics of Aristotle (4 vols., Rome, 1577–80),
and Institutiones dialectice (Lisbon, 1584), etc.
He was the first who taught the doctrine of a scientia
mediae Dei (i.e., what God might have done, but
did not), which afterwards received its name,
its due development, and its influence, under the
hands of Molina.

Font, The Baptismal, originally a cistern,
rather beneath the level of the floor of the bap-
tistery, surrounded by a low wall, and entered
by steps; afterwards a vessel for containing water
used at the administration of baptism. The form
of the font, whether a cistern or a vessel, was gen-
erally the octagon, with reference to the eighth
day, as the day of the resurrection of our Lord;
though other forms, the circle, the hexagon, etc.,
are also found. In the Western Church the fonts
were generally made of some fine marble, and
often highly ornamented: in the Eastern Church
they were made of metal or wood, and generally
without any ornamentation. See art. Font, in
Smith and Cheetham, Dict. Chr. Antiq., and
art. Baptism, in this Cyclopedia, p. 203.

Fontevraud, The Order of (Ordo Fontis-
Ebraiti), was founded by Robert of Arbrisel
(the present Arbresse), b. 1047; d. 1117. After
acting for some years as administrator of the
bishops' of Rennes, and teaching theology for
some other years at Angers, Robert retired into
the forest of Craon, and settled there as a hermit.
Others joined him; and in 1098 he formed a
community of regular canons, out of which after-
wards grew the abbey De la Roc, or De rota.
Selected by Urban II. to go through the country,
and preach penance, the overwhelming impres-
sion he made, especially on women, led to the
foundation of the great monastic institution of
Fontevraud. It comprised, under the title of
poupeus Christi, a male and a female division.
The former was dedicated to St. Benedict; the latter
consisted of three subdivisions, of which the first
was dedicated to the Holy Virgin, and contained
three hundred virgins and widows; the second to
St. Lazarus, containing a hundred and twenty
lepers; and the third to Magdalene, containing
a number of renunciates. The monastic insti-
tution stood under a female head: its first abbe-
was Petronella of Craon-Chemillé. But the
separation between the two sexes was complete,
and the rules for both divisions very severe,—
perpetual silence, total abstinence from flesh and
wine, etc. In 1108 Paschalis II confirmed the
constitution of the order: in 1109 Calixtus II., in
FOOT—WASHING.
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person, consecrated the church. At the death of Robert, the monastery numbered three thousand nuns; and the number rose still higher. Indeed, the institution was still flourishing when it was dissolved by the Revolution. The buildings were transformed into a jail; and the last abbess, Charlotte de Pardaillan, died in destitution, in 1692. The order of Fontevr., Paris, 1643; J. DE LA MAINFERVE: Clmpeus Fontebraudensis, Paris, 1684 (an apologetic work).

TH. PRESSEL.

FOOT—WASHING, an ancient act of hospitality (Gen. xviii. 4; Judg. xix. 21; 1 Sam. xxv. 41, etc.), made necessary in Palestine by the dry climate, dusty roads, and the fact that sandals, covering only the sole of the foot, were worn. Our Lord, the night before his crucifixion, washed the feet of his disciples, and wiped them (John xiii. 1-17), and commanded his disciples to "wash one another's" (xiii. 14). This is usually interpreted to mean that they should emulate his spirit of ministration and humility. It has, however, been taken literally. Upon the basis of this passage and of 1 Tim. v. 10, in which one of the conditions of being admitted to the order of widows is that she had "washed the saints' feet," the Roman and Greek churches and the Tunkers still practise the rite.

Augustine (Ep. ad Januariam) refers to the ceremony of foot-washing as taking place on Maunday-Thursday (the Thursday before Easter). The synod of Toledo, in 694, went so far as to exclude from the communion-table those who refused to have their feet washed on this day. Bernard of Clairvaux even sought to have it recognized as one of the sacraments, but without success. The ceremony is still observed in some of the convents of the Roman Church, and very generally in those of the Greek Church. The czar of Russia, the emperor of Austria, and the kings of Spain, Portugal, and Bavaria, have observed, and perhaps do still observe, the custom of washing the feet of twelve beggars on Maundy-Day. The Pope at Rome, likewise, in illustration of Christian humility, sprinkles a few drops of water on the feet of the priest, women, attired in white tunics, and seated in the Clementine Chapel.

This ceremony Luther denounced as hypocritical, and not at all in the spirit of the Lord's command. He thought the people would "be far better served if they were given a common bath, where they could wash their entire body." And Bengel, in his Commentary, suggested that the Pope would "deserve more admiration, if, instead of washing the feet of twelve beggars, he would in real humility wash the feet of a single king." The Moravians practised foot-washing till 1818, and by Adrian IV., em be loyed in many important commissions, but was by John VIII. deprived of his ecclesiastical position, and even excommunicated, April 18, 876, on account, as it was said, of participation in a conspiracy against Charles the Bald and the holy father himself. By Marinus he was restored, however, to his former dignity; and at the death of Stephen VI. he succeeded to the papal chair, the first instance in the Western Church of the transfer of a bishop from one see to another. On account of the almost complete dissolution of the Frankish Empire, the Pope found it necessary at this period to lean upon some of the native Italian princes; and Wido, Duke of Spoleto, was crowned emperor, together with his son Lambert. But it soon became apparent that dependence upon a neighbor was too dangerous; and Fontevr. was founded on the French model, and crowned emperor. Immediately after Arnulf's return to Germany, Formosus died; and Lambert now entered Rome, and took his revenge by the aid of
FORSTER.

Formentous's successor, Stephen VII. The corpse of the late pope was dug up from the grave and seated in the papal chair; and then a synod was held, accusing him of having intruded himself in St. Peter's see, etc. He was declared guilty; and his remains were atrociously mutilated and defiled, while all his ordinations and consecrations were cancelled. The confusion which arose herefrom was still further promoted by the circumstances that some popes (Sergius III. and John X.) recognized the proceedings of the synod, while others (Theodore II., John IX., and Benedict IV.) declared them null and void; a circumstance which presents an embarrassing argument in the question of papal infallibility. See the writings of Auxilius and Vulpianus, in MABILLON (Anecdotae Vetera, Paris, 1723) and in Dümmler (Auxilius und Vulpianus, Leipzig, 1866).

FORSTER, Johann, b. at Augsburg, July 10, 1495; d. at Wittenberg, Dec. 8, 1556; studied Greek and Hebrew at Ingolstadt, under Reuchlin, and theology at Leipzig and Wittenberg; became one of Luther's favorite pupils, aided him in translating the Old Testament, and was, on his recommendation, made preacher in Augsburg, 1535. But in Augsburg, as afterwards in Tubingen and in other places, his strict and exclusive Lutheranism brought him in conflict with his colleagues. In 1548 he was made professor in Hebrew at Wittenberg. His great work is his Dictionarium Hebraicun Novum, published at Basel, after his death, 1557.

FORTIFICATIONS AMONG THE HEBREWS.

In general each place was surrounded by a wall; but municipal places had fortifications containing garrisons, especially in times of war (2 Chron. xvii. 2). Thus Jerusalem was fortified by David (2 Sam. v. 7, 9), and the work of its fortification continued in later times (2 Chron. xxxii. 5). Solomon also built forts throughout the land (1 Kings ix. 15, 17 sq.; 2 Chron. viii. 5); and their number was increased as necessity required, especially after the exile and during the Jewish war. Among them were Massada and Machera.

Such fortified places were surrounded by one, sometimes by double or triple, walls (2 Chron. xvii. 2). Over the gateways, which were closed by ponderous doors, and secured by wooden or metallic bars, were watch-towers, and around the walls was a ditch. Besides these large fortresses, there were also castles or citadels, as well as forts. In the forests and in the open fields watch-towers were also found.

During the war, in case a city thus fortified would not surrender voluntarily, a siege was laid against it, and operations began, whereby the wall could be approached (2 Sam. xx. 15; 2 Kings xix. 32; Jer. vi. 6, xxxii. 24; Ezek. xxvi. 8 sq.). After this the besiegers were set against the walls. That the besieged did not remain idle, but endeavored to prevent the approach of the enemy, we see from passages like Isa. xxxii. 10; Jer. xxxii. 4, 2 Sam. xi. 21, 24, 2 Chron. xxvi. 15; and thus it happened that strongly fortified places were more easily taken. Thus Ashdod was besieged twenty-nine years, Samaria three years (2 Kings xvii. 5), Jerusalem a year and a half (xxv. 1, 2). But cities taken were razed to the ground, and their inhabitants killed, or sold as slaves. If they capitulated, they were more leniently dealt with (Deut. xx. 11 sq.; 1 Mac. xiii. 12 sq.). The Chaldæans were the most famous besiegers of antiquity.

FORTUNATUS, Venantius Honorius Clementianus, b. about 580 at Treviso; d. at Poitiers about 608; studied grammar and rhetoric at Ravenna; lived for some time at the court of SIGIBERT, king of Austrasia, by whose poetry; repaired thence to Tours, and afterwards to Poitiers, where he settled in a monastery founded by the divorced wife of Clothaire I., the learned Radegund; entered finally the service of the church, and became Bishop of Poitiers about 599. His fame, however, he acquired as a poet; and he is, indeed, the last great poet of the period before Charlemagne. He wrote epics (among which is the life of St. Martin, in hexameters, based on the works of Sulpicius Severus), lyrics (especially hymns), epistles, epigrams, didactic and descriptive poems, etc. The two most celebrated of his hymns are Vexilla regis protesti and Pange, lingua, gloriosi; of which Neale's translations are found in SCHRAPP'S Christ in Song, New York, 1869. The best edition of his works is that by Luchi, Rome, 1758, in 2 vols. 4to, incorporated with MINUS, Patrol. Lat., vol. lxxviii., cols. 595 sqq. See EERDT, Geschichte d. latein. christ. Literatur bis zum Zeitalter Karls d. Grossen, vol. i., Leipzig, 1874, pp. 494-516.

FOSCARARI (Egidius Fsccherarius), b. at Bologna, Jan. 27, 1512; d. in Rome, Dec. 23, 1564; entered early the Dominican order; preached, and taught theology, in various cities of Italy; and was appointed Magister sacri palatii by Paul III. in 1546, and Bishop of Modena in 1550 by Julius III. In 1551 he was sent to the Council of Trent, and when (April 26, 1552) its meetings were suspended he returned to his episcopal see. Under Paul IV. (in 1555) he was accused of heresy, and imprisoned in the Castle St. Angelo. Though the Inquisition could prove no heresy against him, he was not released until after Paul's death. By Pius IV. he was once more sent to the Council of Trent, and made a member of the Committee on the Catechism and the Revision of the Missal.

FOSTER, Leopold, D.D., 1548-1605, and wall-Doming minister; b. in Exeter, Sept. 10, 1587; d. Nov. 5, 1588. He became pastor in London in 1724. He was an eloquent preacher, and won the eulogies of Pope and others. Many of his sermons were published. Amongst his other writings the most important is The Usefulness, Truth, and Excellency of the Christian Revelation, etc., 1734, a defence against Tindal the deist.

FOSTER, John, a Baptist clergyman and eminent essayist; b. in Halifax, Yorkshire, Sept. 17, 1770; d. at Stapleton, near Bristol, Oct. 15, 1848. He engaged in weaving wool till he was seventeen. How he secured his primary education is unknown. Becoming a member of the Baptist Church at this time, he determined to study for the ministry; entered Brearly Hall, and subsequently passed into the Baptist College, Bristol. In 1792 he preached for three months at Newcasle-on-Tyne; passed from there to Lincoln; in 1794 he became pastor of the Baptist Church, Chichester, where he remained till 1800, when he was called to Downend. From here, in 1804, he removed to Frome. A throat trouble obliged him to resign.
in 1806. The year before, he published his essays, and became contributor to The Elecric Magazine. In 1817 he determined to take pastor work. He was put as requisite in the priest of his parish, he "would get into the orchards and fields" with his Bible by himself. Regarding the priests less, he looked more after the dissenters, among whom he found "some tenderness," but no one that could speak to his need. "And when all my hopes in them," he says, "and in all men, were gone, so that I had nothing outwardly to help me, nor could tell what to do, then, oh! then, I heard a voice which said, 'There is one, even Christ Jesus, that can speak to thy condition.' And when I heard it, my heart did leap for joy. . . . Christ it was (who had enlightened me) that gave me his light to believe in, and gave me hope, which is himself, revealed himself in me, and gave me his spirit, and gave me his grace, which I found sufficient in the deeps and in weakness." Afterwards the hearts and natures of wicked men were revealed to him, that he might have a sense of all conditions, and thus be able to speak to all conditions; and he "saw that there was an ocean of darkness and death, but an infinite ocean of light and love which flowed over the ocean of darkness," and in that he saw "the infinite love of God." In 1848 he began to exercise his ministry publicly in market-places, in the fields, in appointed meetings of various kinds, sometimes in the "steeple-houses," after the priests had got through. His preaching was powerful; and many people joined him in professing the same faith in the spirituality of true religion. In a few years the Society of Friends had formed itself spontaneously under the preaching of Fox and his companions. Fox afterwards showed great powers, as a religious legislator, in the admirable organization which he gave to the new society. He seems, however, to have had no desire to found a sect, but only to proclaim the pure and genuine principles of Christianity in their original simplicity. In 1650 the name "Quakers" was first applied to the Friends in derision, by "one Justice Bennet," because Fox had hidden the justices to "tremble at the word of the Lord." Fox was often arrested and imprisoned for violating the laws forbidding unauthorized worship. He was imprisoned at Darby in 1650, Carlisle in 1653, London in 1654, Lancaster in 1656, Lancaster in 1660 and 1663, Scarborough in 1666, and Worcester in 1674, in noisome dungeons, and with much attendant cruelty. In prison his pen was active, and hardly less potent than his voice. In 1669 Fox married Margaret Fell of Swarthmore Hall, a lady of high social position, and one of his early converts. In 1671 he went to Barbadoes and the English settlements in America, where he remained two years. In 1672 he attended the Yearly Meeting at Newport, R.I., which lasted for six days. At the end of this meeting he says, "It was somewhat hard for Friends to part; for the glorious power of the Lord was so near his soul, and his blessed truth and life flowing amongst them, had so knit and united them together, that they spent two days in taking leave one of another, and of the Friends of the island." In 1677 and 1684 he visited the Friends in Holland, and organized their meetings for discipline. He died in London, Nov. 13, 1690, having preached with great power two days before, and was buried on
the 16th, in the Friends' Ground, near Bunhill Fields.

Fox is described by Thomas Ellwood, the friend of Milton, as "graceful in countenance, manly in personage, grave in gesture, courteous in conversation." Penn says he was "civil beyond all forms of breeding." We are told that he was "plain, simple, powerful in prayer," "a discerner of other men's spirits," and "very much master of his own," skilful to "speak a word in due season to the conditions and capacities of most, especially to them that were weary, and wanted soul's rest;" "valiant in asserting the truth, bold in defending it, patient in suffering for it, immovable as a rock."


Fox (or Foxe), John, author of the Book of Martyrs; was b. in Boston, Lincolnshire, 1517; d. April 15, 1587. He was educated at Oxford, and became fellow of Magdalen College, where he applied himself to the diligent study of church history. He espoused Protestant sentiments, and for this was expelled from his college. He became tutor in Sir Thomas Lucy's family, and then to the children of the Earl of Surrey, but was obliged to seek refuge from persecution on the Continent. He went to Basel, where he laid the plan of the work which has given him fame. At the elevation of Elizabeth he returned to England, but never received higher position than that of prebend of Salisbury Cathedral. Called by Archbishop Parker to subscribe to the canons, he refused, and, holding up a Greek Testament, said, "To this will I subscribe." He was fearless of preparation, and appeared in its first form at Basel, 1554; the first complete Eng. ed., in 1563, 4th ed., 1583, etc. The original title was Actes and Monuments of these latter perillous days touching matters of the churches. From the year of our Lorde a thousand to the time now present, etc. By order of Elizabeth this work was placed in the common halls of archbishops, bishops, deans, etc., and in all the colleges and chapels throughout the kingdom. It exercised a great influence upon the masses of the people long after its author was dead. The Roman Catholics early attacked it, and pointed out its blunders. Fox wrote other works; for these see a volume in British Reformers, published at London. The Book of Martyrs has appeared in numerous editions, the best of which are those of Rev. M. H. Seymour (New York, 1886) and of Rev. George Townsend, M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, with a Life of the Author, and Vindication of the Work, London, 1843.

Fox, Richard, English prelate and statesman; b. at close of the reign of Henry VI.; d. Sept. 14, 1528. He was educated at Oxford. He was a great favorite of Henry VII., and filled the offices of privy councillor, keeper of the privy seal, and secretary of state. In turn he was Bishop of Exeter, Bath and Wells (1491), Durham (1494), and Winchester (1500), and master of Pembroke College, Cambridge (1507-19). Wolsley was his protegé; and he was much mortified at that favorite's insults and superior influence. He founded Corpus Christi, Oxford (1516), and the free schools of Taunton and Grentham.

Fragments, Wolfenbüttel. See Wolfenbüttel Fragments.

France, Ecclesiastical Statistics of. — France comprises an area of 525,577 square kilometers, with 36,905,788 inhabitants (according to the census of 1876), of whom 36,357,703 belong to the Roman-Catholic Church, 467,531 to the Reformed, 80,117 to the Lutheran, and 33,109 to other Protestant denominations; 49,499 are Jews, and the rest belong to no confession. Thus the overwhelming majority of the French population is Roman Catholic, and there is no prospect of any change in the proportion at present; but liberty of conscience, and freedom of worship, are constitutionally guaranteed in the country, and a remarkable religious movement (headed by McAll) has been going on among the laboring and lower Roman-Catholic classes in Paris and other cities.

I. The Roman-Catholic Church. — In order to give a just representation of the state of the Roman-Catholic Church in France at this moment, it is necessary to consider (a) its organization and official relation to the State and the Pope, (b) the support it receives from the congregations and the religious associations, and (c) the influence it exercises on the school, and education in general.

(a) The French Church consists of 18 archbishoprics and 88 bishoprics; that is, of 96 dioceses: but the Roman Catholic, is, like the pallium, which pertains to certain sees (for instance, to that of Autun), a distinction of rank only, not of dignity, still less of power. Though five of the archbishoprics are cardinalates (Bordeaux, Cambray, Paris, Rennes, and Rouen), they have as such no special authority in the country. Each bishop is the sole and proper chief of his diocese, and maintains direct communication with the State and with the Pope. Apostolical equality between the bishops is the first maxim of the French Church. The bishop governs his diocese independently, restrained only by the general ecclesiastical laws and the will of the Pope. He arranges the whole course of theological education, lays out the programme of study, selects the handbooks, chooses the professors: he ordains, appoints, and discharges the priests, founds or confirms all religious associations, calls or installs the ecclesiastics who teach in the State schools, excommunicates and re-admits, etc.

In the administration of his diocese the bishop is aided by vicar-generals, secretaries, a court,
and a chapter. The number of vicar-generals varies with the size of the diocese. The government pays two, or sometimes three. Their title is vicaires généraux titulaires, and their number 187. Others are appointed by the bishop himself, but only for the internal affairs of the church. Their title is vicaires généraux honoraires, and their number may be larger. Of secretaries, the government pays 135. The episcopal court, which is composed of an official, a vice-official, one or more assessors, a promoteur, and a greffier; but all the members hold other offices at the same time. The chapter has also lost its former importance. It is divided into three classes, — chanoines d'honneur, titulaires, and honoraires; but only the second class is paid by the State, and has any practical significance. It takes care of the service, and numbers 763.

The lower clergy consists of curés, desservants, and vicaires. The curés are priests of the curés, or principal parishes, and are appointed by the bishop; though their appointment must be confirmed by the government. In 1878 they numbered 3,440. The desservants are priests of the succursales, or subordinate parishes, and are appointed and dismissed by the bishop alone (ad numam amonestabiles). Though they are only a kind of help to the curés, the latter have no authority over them, only a right of superintendence with report to the bishop. The number of desservants is 31,191. The vicaires, finally, who act only as assistants to the curés and desservants, number 11,679. As in the large cities the service of the masses requires a greater number of officials, the State pays 4,423 prêtres habituels for this purpose. Adding furthermore the almoners of the lyceums, colleges, normal schools, hospitals, and asylums (who are appointed by the respective administrations, but stand under the authority of the bishop), the clergy of the army, the navy, and the colonies, the teachers and pupils in the theological seminaries, etc., the total number of the clergy recognized and paid by the State amounts to 68,750. The budget of 1877 allowed 51,526,445 francs for the expenses of the Roman-Catholic Church, of which 1,640,000 francs were for the establishment of a community whose aim was a merely contemplative life, the congregations, nevertheless, contrived to set apart for this purpose a portion of their members. It is very difficult, however, to obtain complete and reliable statistics on this field. There is a general report from 1861, — Statistique de France, Strasbourg, 1864, the result of the general census of 1861; and there is a more special report, — État des congrégations, communautés et associations religieuses autorisées ou non autorisées, laid before the legislative assembly in 1878. Both are valuable documents, but neither is complete. A comparison between these two reports reveals the interesting fact, that while, in 1861, the number of all the members, male and female, of the religious orders in France was only 108,119, it had in 1878 risen to 158,040. This last figure, however, is not correct any longer, since the law of 1879 made the confirmation by the State necessary to the legal existence of any association whatever; and disobedience to this law caused the expulsion of the Jesuits, Benedictines, Dominicans, etc.

The female associations which have been confirmed by the State comprise 224 Congrégations à supérieure générale proprement dites, organized for the whole country, namely, 11 for nursing, 68 for education, and 155 both for nursing and education, with 2,450 houses and 93,215 sisters; 35 Congrégations diocésaines & supérieure générale, organized only for some special diocese, namely, 6 for nursing, 6 for education, and 23 both for nursing and education, with 102 houses and 3,794 sisters; and 844 Communautés à supérieure locale indépendantes, namely, 312 for education, 159 for nursing, 167 both for education and nursing, and 16 for a contemplative life, with 16,741 sisters. The total number of members of these associations is 113,750, to which must be added, according to the report of 1878, 14,003 sisters belonging to religious orders not recognized by the State. The names of the principal orders of the first kind are, Filles de la Charité de St. Vincent de Paul, numbering 9,130 members, with 89 stations; Petites Sœurs des Pauvres, founded at St. Servan, in Brest, in 1840, by Abbé le Poillevé, and numbering 2,685 members, with 184 stations; Filles de Sagesse, numbering 2,588 members, with 105 stations; Sœurs de S. Joseph, numbering 2,530 members, with 155 stations, etc. See CALMETTE, Traité de l'administration des associations religieuses, 1877.

Only 32 male associations have obtained the confirmation of the State; the reason being, that according to the law of Jan. 2, 1817, the chief of the State can confirm a female association by a simple decree, while a male association must be recognized by the legislative assembly. Among the legalized associations two are devoted to work in the seminaries, — Congrégation de S. Lazare (numbering 1,185 members) and Compagnie des prêtres de S. Sulive (numbering 300 members); and three are devoted to missionary work, — Congrégation des Missions étrangères (with 480 members), Congrégation de S. Esprit (with 515 members), and Congrégation de S. François de Sales (with 28 members). The total number of members belonging to these associations is 22,843. In certain respects, however, the associations which never sought and never obtained the sanction of the civil government were of
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much more importance,—the Jesuits, Benedictines, Dominicans, Carthusians, Franciscans, etc. The Jesuits returned to France with the Bourbons in 1814, and from that time their influence has been steadily increasing up to 1878, in which year they numbered 58 houses, with 1,471 inmates. The Benedictines numbered 239 members, in 18 houses; the Dominicans 303, in 21 houses; the Trappists 1,158, in 17 houses, etc. But, as all these associations refused to seek the State's legalization of their existence, the houses were broken up in 1860, and the inmates expelled.

Among the lay associations, especially two have acquired great celebrity; namely, Société de St. Vincent de Paul and Société de St. François Régis. The former devoted itself, besides, to other kinds of charity,—to guarding the youth from temptation and seduction; and in 1852 no less than 181,000 young persons stood under its protection.

The latter devoted itself, besides, to other kinds of missionary work. It has about six millions of francs a year at its disposal, and publishes Annales de la propagation de la Foi and Les Missions catholiques, which appear at Lyons, the former in eight, the latter in four languages.

The constitution of the Reformed and Lutheran churches rest on the law of April 7, 1802, completed and somewhat modified by the law of March 26, 1852. Each congregation has its presbytery, whose lay members are elected by universal suffrage. Above the presbytery stands the consistory, one for each six thousand souls, and consisting of the ministers and representatives of the presbyteries. The consistory chooses its own president; but he must be a clergyman, and obtain the confirmation of the government. Five consistories were destined to form a provincial synod in the Reformed, and an inspection in the Lutheran Church. The provincial synods, however, were never formed, nor was the Reformed Church allowed to convene its general synod until 1872. The Lutheran Church was in this respect more fortunate. It formed its inspections, and obtained in its directory a centre of organization, to which the power of appointing the ministers was confided, without any restrictions from the side of the consistories or the congregations. The Reformed Church comprises 100 consistories (one for each 4,675 souls), and the Lutheran 6 (one for each 15,972 souls). The State pays 616 Reformed ministers (one for each 759 souls), and 64 Lutheran (one for each 4,675 souls). The budget of 1877 allowed 1,490,600 francs for the expenses of the Protestant churches; but this sum was overrun by 20,000 francs.

For the historical development of the French churches see the arts FRANKS, GALICANISM, GAUL, HUGUENOTS, etc.

The above article is a condensation of the article on the subject in the first English edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica, in which free instruction is given, the latest statistics are found in A. Legoyt, La France et l'Etranger, études de statistique comparée, Paris, 1870. Of primary schools maintained by the State, 35,348 schools for boys, or for boys and girls, with 1,880,441 pupils, had lay teachers, while 2,038 schools with 412,852 pupils had teachers from the congregations. Connected with these schools were 4,484 supplementary schools for apprentices, Sunday classes, etc., of which 4,471 with 54,427 pupils were under lay, and 377 with 36,088 pupils under clerical leadership. Of primary schools for girls, 5,998 with 317,342 pupils had lay teachers; while 8,061 with 697,195 pupils had teachers from the Congregations. Of 1,192 boarding-schools for girls, 184 with 1,862 inmates were under lay, and 1,008 with 15,065 inmates under clerical leadership. Of primary schools maintained by private support, 2,572 schools for boys with 125,779 pupils had lay, and 543 with 82,903 pupils, teachers from the Congregations; 7,687 schools for girls with 290,208 pupils had lay, and 5,571 with 417,825 pupils, teachers from the Congregations.
were prevented from exercising any appreciable social influence, and had to submit to numberless petty chicaneries from the surrounding Roman-Catholic population; and, though the churches of the Desert were generally convinced at, actual persecutions occurred now and then. In this state of affairs the edict of toleration brought a change in 1787; and as the Protestants could not fail recognizing a movement towards liberation in the dawning Revolution, they joined it with eagerness: there sat nine Protestant pastors in the Constituent Assembly. A decree of Dec. 24, 1789, made the Protestants eligible to all civil offices, and another, of Dec. 25, 1790, restored the property confiscated by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes to the descendants of the exiles, on the condition that they should return home, and become French citizens. The real work of restoration, however, did not begin until after the conclusion of the concordat (July 15, 1801), when Napoleon undertook to reorganize the church affairs of France. The Protestants were placed on equal terms with the Roman Catholics; their churches were restored to them; their pastors were to be paid by the State; a Lutheran seminary was founded at Strassburg, a Reformed at Montauban, 1808, etc. All these reforms were, of course, received with gratitude by the Protestants, though it soon became evident that the new church constitution was very inferior to the old. In 1837 the Reformed Church in France had had eight hundred and six churches, served by six hundred and forty-one pastors; in 1806 she had only a hundred and seventy-one churches, and of these fifty had no pastors. This loss might be repaired; but how was the religious life of those times, the active piety, the fervent spirit, to be revived? In its new constitution the Church was wholly dependent on the State, and curtailed both in its freedom and in its authority. The congregation exercised no influence on the choice of its pastor, the most essential element of freedom; and Napoleon refused to revive the national synod, the most essential element of authority. Indeed, the prospects were not so very promising. After Napoleon's fall, a sort of curetting of re-action set in, stimulated by the fiercest feelings of revenge, the hatred of the Roman Catholics to the Protestants also showed itself. Riots took place, especially in Southern France, and grew into actual persecution. Around Nîmes more than one hundred and twenty houses were destroyed, the houses burnt, and the fields laid waste, and more than two hundred persons were killed. The government seemed inclined to look on with indifference, until it was compelled by remonstrances from England to interfere, and maintain order. As soon, however, as the Protestant Church once more felt herself protected in her plain rights, she began to develop a very remarkable activity in the field of education.

The consistory of Paris opened its first school Dec. 31, 1817, with three pupils. But at the same time the first Sunday school in France was begun by a Protestant pastor in Paris. The method of mutual instruction was introduced by Protestant teachers. In 1819 the first Bible Society was founded in France, and met with great sympathy; a Tract Society (1821) and a Society for Evangelical Mission (1822) were also successful. The Society for the Development of Primary Instruction among French Protestants was founded in 1829, and developed rapidly. The first Protestant papers, Archives du Christianisme (1817), and Mélanges de Religion (1820), were established, and proved successful. Less encouraging was the aspect which the internal state of the Church presented. The old orthodoxy still found its firm defenders; but it soon began to dwindle, even to the stanchest among them, that it would be impossible to maintain a dogmatic system which was at variance with all the reigning ideas of the age, which, indeed, though none as yet attacked it, most had ceased to understand. Religion regained rapidly in the nineteenth century what it had lost in the eighteenth. But a crisis like the French Revolution cannot be gone through without making all the old forms more or less unfit for use. A movement was necessary; but it was a misfortune that it should come from without, and come at a moment when the Church was bereft of its principal organ of authority, the national synod.

The first who attempted the evangelization of France were disciples of Wesley. In 1790 they founded several small missionary stations in Normandy and Bretagne; but during the reign of Napoleon their activity almost ceased. After the battle of Waterloo, however, they immediately resumed work, and a church was built at Cherbourg. They labored with prudence and moderation; but it was, nevertheless, easy to see, that, if they succeeded, the result of their labor would be the establishment of a number of independent churches, and the breaking-up of the Reformed Church of France. In 1826 Guizot characterized the situation as merely involving a difference between those who looked at the primitive, and those who looked at the progressive, in the common religion. But the characterization was too mild: independent churches were at that moment formed or forming in Lyons, Havre, Strassburg, St. Etienne, etc. In 1834 the consistory of Paris took some steps in order to organize an authoritative representation of the Reformed Church of France, and thereby procure a revision of her organic law. In 1836 the minister of worship and public instruction made a similar attempt, but both in vain; and when, finally, an unofficial synod was assembled in 1848, the actual split took place. There were at that moment three parties within the Church: one, the Latitudinarians, whose principal object was the maintenance of the national Church; another, the Revivalists, who considered a separation unavoidable when the cause of true religion should be truly served; and a third, which considered it possible to reach the object of the Revivalists by the means of the Latitudinarians. The synod assembled Sept. 11, 1848; but when the assembly altogether refused to attempt the establishment of a clear and positive confession of faith, F. Monod and Count Gasparin retired, and invited, a month later, the Protestant Church to meet at a new synod the following year. This synod, which assembled Aug. 20, 1849, thirteen churches perfectly constituted, and eighteen churches in process of formation, were represented; an explicit confession of faith was adopted; and the Union des Églises évangéliques de France
was constituted. The imperial decree of March 26, 1852, made considerable changes in the constitution of the Reformed Church in France (thus it gave back to the parishioners the right to elect their pastor); but on the development of the internal life of the Church it had no influence. The last hope of healing the split was the convocation of a national synod such as had not met since the synod of Lodi, 1859.

June 6, 1872, the thirteenth national synod met in Paris, but not under the most favorable auspices. All relations had ceased for several years between the orthodox and the liberal; and the incessant polemics had caused many to entirely forget that they were members of the same church. A vehement debate arose on the question of the confession of faith. By a vote of sixty-one against forty-five, a short confession was adopted, and its subscription made obligatory on all young pastors. But the result of this vote was, that, when the synod assembled in a second session (Nov. 20, 1872), the seats of the liberal party stood empty, and the liberal party was represented only by a protest laid on the table. There was, however, on both sides, among the orthodox as well as among the liberals, a strong feeling against a schism, even though it might be effected without the separating party losing any of the advantages which accrue to the Church from its connection with the State. In a circular of Nov. 12, 1874, the liberals declared that the difference between the orthodox and themselves was not a question of faith, but simply a question of authority in matters of faith; that though, on account of this difference, there had arisen factions within the Reformed Church, these factions were not sects, etc. Equally conciliatory are the orthodox in their expressions; but there is nevertheless very little hope at present that a new session will be able to bring about a full and thorough agreement.


FRANCIS OF ASSISI, St., was b. at Assisi, 1182; d. there Oct. 4, 1226. His true name was Giovanni Francesco Bernardone. His father was a rich merchant. Handsome, bright, and adventurous, with a keen relish of beauty in all things, he was the leader of a club of the gay youths of Assisi, served in a preacher, to restore the ruined house of God in a higher sense of the word; and fitted out like one of the apostles, with his abode, and to the streets of Assisi. He made an impression. Other young men joined him; and in 1210 he lived with ten followers in hermitages near the Portiuncula Church. For these ten followers he wrote a rule. A statement, containing the monastic vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, but emphasizing the first point with particular stress. He then repaired to Rome, to have his rule confirmed, and his society recognized, by the Pope; but he obtained only the verbal assent of Innocent III. Shortly after his return from Rome, however, he was joined by Clara Sciffi, the foundress of the order of the Clarisses (which article see); and this circumstance threw great lustre both over his person and his enterprise. In 1212 he sent out the brethren, two and two, to reform the world by preaching penitence. He went himself to Tuscany. In Perugia, Pisa, and Florence he found many followers; in Cortona he was able to found the first Franciscan monastery; from the Count of Casentino he received Monte Alberno as a present. But the five brethren he had sent to Morocco to preach the gospel to the Mohammedans were martyred; and he now determined to go thither himself. In Spain, however, through which he took his way, he was detained by sickness, and compelled to return. Meanwhile, the order grew steadily and rapidly in Italy. At the general assembly of the order, in 1219, no less than five thousand members came together; and brethren were sent to Spain, Egypt, Africa, Greece, England, and Hungary. Hitherto every attempt the order had made to penetrate into Germany had failed. But in 1221, Cesarius of Spires, with twelve other brethren of German descent, went to Germany; and from that moment the order took root in the country. In the same year Francis himself set out for Egypt, and actually preached before the Sultan, though without any effect. The success of the order was now fully assured; and the Pope was consequently willing to transform his verbal assent into official acknowledgment. By a bull of 1223 Honorius III. confirmed the rules, and sanctioned the order, and Francis was made its first general.

In the very next year, however, he left the government of the order to Elias of Cartona, and retired to the Portiuncula Church, where he died. He was canonized in 1228 by Gregory IX.

LIT.—His Opuscula were published by Wadding, Antwerp, 1603, and often afterwards. His life was first written by Thomas of Celano, only three years after his death: this, together with that by Bonaventura, is found in Acta Sanctorum, Oct., 111. To Rome: and while there, a voice from above seemed to say to him that he should go and restore the ruined house of God. He took the words in their literal meaning; and, with the money which he begged together, he rebuilt a small decayed church in his native city (the Portiuncula), which even at that time was considered a sacred place. A sermon he heard on Matt. x. 9, 10, opened up a new channel to his energy. He determined to become a preacher, to restore the ruined house of God in
fasting and other ascetic practices. When he was fourteen years old, he retired to a cave on the seashore, where he lived as a hermit; and when he was twenty, so great a number of hermits had gathered around him, that he could constitute them an order, and give them a rule. They were to observe the Franciscans in austerity; and to the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience was added a fourth one, of perpetual fasting; that is, of refraining not only from all kinds of flesh, but also from milk, butter, cheese, eggs, etc. The order was confirmed in 1474 by Sixtus IV., under the name of the "Hermit St. Francis," which by Alexander VI. was changed to that of the "Minims," and Francis was made its superior. His fame as a miracle-worker was so great, that Louis XI., on his death-bed, had him brought to France, and implored him to prolong his life; which, however, he refused to try. Charles VIII. also held him in great favor; and he remained in France, where he founded several monasteries. He was canonized by Leo X. in 1519. See HALLMONT DE COSTE: Le portrait de S. François de Paul, Paris, 1555; FR. GYRT: Vie de S. François de Paul, Paris, 1880; Act. Sanct., April; [ROLLAS: Hisoire de Saint François de Paul, 2d ed., Paris, 1870.]

See Minims.

FRANCIS OF SALES, St., b. at Sales, Savoy, 1567; d. at Lyons, Dec. 28, 1622; studied law and theology in Paris and Padua; entered the Order of the Minims; was ordained a priest in 1591, and appointed a member of the chapter of the Bishop of Geneva, who, since the victory of the Reformation in that city, resided at the neighboring Annecy. Very successful in re-establishing the Roman Church in the Chablais and the Pays de Gex, he acquired a great fame as a missionary among the Protestants. He even tried to convert Beza; and his Roman biographers assert that the number of his Protestant converts amounted to seventy-two thousand. He was, at all events, one of the most energetic and influential representatives of the Roman-Catholic re-action which set in immediately after the Reformation. In 1599 he was made co-adjutor to the Bishop of Geneva, and in 1602 he became Bishop of Geneva himself. In 1604 he founded, together with Madame de Chantal, the order of the Visitants. With Sister Angelica of Port Royal, he also maintained very intimate relations. As a writer he is a precursor of the so-called Quietism. His collected works have often been published; e.g., in Paris, 1836 (4 vols.), again in 1847. He was canonized in 1690, and made a doctor of the church in 1777 by Pius IX. His life was written by Marsollier, [Hamon (Paris, 1854), and Perennès (Paris, 1858). A selection, in English, of his Spiritual Letters appeared in London, 1871, in a biography, London, 1877.]

FRANCIS XAVIER, b. at Xavier, in Navarre, April 7, 1506; d. in Canton, China, Dec. 2, 1552; was a teacher of Aristotelian philosophy in Paris when he became acquainted with Loyola; and was one of the original members of the Society of Jesus. Until the order was confirmed by the Pope, he labored in the hospitals of Northern Italy. He then went as a missionary to the East Indies. April 7, 1541, he left Portugal, and May 6, 1542, he landed at Goa. Seven years he spent in the Indies and the Malayan Archipelago. In 1549 he went to Japan, where he spent two years; and in 1552 he went to China, where he died. The immediate result of his missionary labor was, perhaps, not so very great, as he did not understand the languages, but was compelled to use an interpreter: at all events, it seems a great exaggeration to call him the apostle of Japan. He remained in China, and to compare him with Paul. But indirectly he exercised a great influence by organizing and consolidating the Portuguese mission in the Indies, and by opening up Japan and China to the Christian missionaries. The principal source of his life is his Letters, the best edition of which is that of Bologna (1795). His life was written by Tursellini, 1596; Joar de Lucena, 1600; Bontours, 1832; Reithmeier, 1846 (Roman-Catholic); and by Yven, 1862, and W. Hoffmann, 1869 (Protestant). G. FLITTE.

FRANCIS, CONVERSE, D.D., a Unitarian clergyman; b. at West Cambridge, Mass., Nov. 9, 1795; d. at Cambridge, April 7, 1868. He graduated at Harvard in 1815; was pastor of the Unitarian Church in Watertown from 1819 to 1842, and professor of "pulpit eloquence and pastoral care" at Harvard from 1842 until his death. He published some lectures, and wrote the biographies of Rev. John Eliot and Sebastian Râle for SPARKS's Am. Biogr.

FRANCISCANS (Minorites, Gray Friars, in England and Ireland, sometimes also the Seraphic Brethren), The Order of the, was founded by St. Francis of Assisi in 1210, and confirmed by Honorius III. in 1229. In the middle of the thirteenth century it had eight thousand monasteries, with two hundred thousand monks.

This extraordinary success was due to various causes. Immediately after his death, the founder of the order was transformed into a kind of divinity in the eyes of the time. The story that Christ had appeared to him on Monte Alermo, and imprinted on his hands and feet the stigmata of the crucifixion, was universally believed. Pope Alexander IV. and St. Clara had seen the marks; Gregory IX., Nicholas III., Benedict XII., Paul V., vouched for the truth. When Bonaventura wrote his life of St. Francis, the most incredible fictions would be easily believed when told of the "seraphic" saints; and in 1399 Bartholomew Albizzi actually instituted a comparison between Christ and St. Francis, in his Liber Conformitatum. Of still greater effect were the enormous privileges which the popes granted to the order. Already in 1222 Honorius III. allowed the Franciscans to celebrate service, though with closed doors, in places which were under the ban. Soon after, they obtained the right to preach wherever they liked without first procuring the consent of the bishop or parish priest. They were permitted to hear confession, and give absolution; and, in the same year they were constituted as an order, they received the Portiuncula indulgence; that is, every one who visited the Portiuncula Church on the anniversary of its consecration (Aug. 2), received the remission of all his sins. But, beyond these and other favorable circumstances, the very idea on which the order was based, the very principle on which it worked,
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corresponded to the deepest wants of the time. Everybody felt that reform was necessary; and the humble, miserable Franciscan, clad in rags, but filled with holy enthusiasm, struck everybody as the reformer.

But success always engenders jealousy; and the Dominicans were the born rivals of the Franciscans. They understood it as a time coming together, side by side, as long as they had a common object; namely, to get access to the universities. But hardly were Bonaventura the Franciscan, and Thomas Aquinas the Dominican, installed as doctores theologiae at the university of Paris, before a strongly marked scientific difference between the two orders became apparent, and it continued to separate them during the whole period of the middle ages. The Franciscans were realists; the Dominicans, nominalists: the Franciscans leaned towards Semi-Pelagianism; the Dominicans were ardent disciples of Augustine; the Franciscans were Scotists; the Dominicans were Thomists: in the debate on the immaculate conception of Mary, the Franciscans said Yes, and the Dominicans, No. But the difference was by no means confined to the sphere of science: it came to many vexatious and sometimes ridiculous outbursts of rivalry between the two orders also in practical life.

Of much greater importance, however, was the difference which arose within the order itself almost immediately after its foundation. The absolute poverty which the founder had ordered seemed to some to be a mere impediment to the success of the order; while by others it was vindicated as the very character of the order. There thus arose two parties,—a milder, headed by Elias of Cortona; and a severer, headed by Cessarius of Spiraes (see H. RYDBA, Elia von Cortona, Leipzig, 1874); and the contest between these two parties not only threw the order itself into confusion, but at times also involved the Pope and the kings in serious difficulties. Nicholas III. attempted a reconciliation by the bull Exiit, 1279, in which he explained, that though the Franciscans were not allowed to own things, they were, of course, allowed to use things; that the real owner of all the treasures, profits, etc., which the order had amassed, was the Pope; and that the members of the order only had the use of these treasures by his permission, etc. This subtle distinction did not satisfy the severer party. Under the leadership of John of Oliva they raised a violent opposition to the bull and to the general of the order, Matthias of Aquas Spartas, who headed the milder party. The latter was victorious, however; and the Spiritualists, as the severer party was called, were cruelly persecuted. In Naples they were expelled; and in many places they were seized by the Inquisition, tortured, and burnt. Nevertheless, they continued their resistance, and under John XXII. the strife broke out with renewed vehemence; the general, Michael of Cesena, being this time at the head of the Spiritualists (see E. GUDENZAT, Michael von Cesena, Breslau, 1876). The result was a permanent split in the order. The Observants, the severer party, were formally recognized by the Council of Constance in its fourteenth sitting (Sept. 23, 1415); and Leo X., after an ineffectual attempt to gather the whole order under one observance, constituted the milder party, the Conventuals, an independent congregation, by a bull of 1517. Each division obtained its own superior; though that of the Observants (the minister generalis) took rank before that of the Conventuals (the minister generalis).

In another respect these internal differences contributed to the character of the order also. The frequent formation of more or less independent congregations proved the presence of an active principle of development and reform. By the Reformation the order lost heavily, and a great number of its convents were broken up. Nevertheless, at the beginning of the eighteenth century it still numbered about a hundred and fifteen thousand monks; and its monasteries are still flourishing, from the interior of Russia to the interior of America. It has produced five popes (Nicholas IV., Alexander V., Sixtus IV., Sixtus V., and Clement XIV.), a considerable number of the confessors, Alexander of Hales, Ockham, etc.), and of poets, Thomas de Celano, the author of Dies irae, Jacobpone da Todi, the author of Stabat mater, etc. (See OZANAM, Les poetes franciscains en Italie, Paris, 1862.)

LIT. — The history of the order has been written by an Irish Franciscan, Lucas Wadding (Annales minorum s. trium ordinum a. s. Franciscus institutorum), 17 vols., Rome, 1731-41, reaching to 1840, and continued to 1853 by I. de Luca. See also the works of HELYOT (vol. vii.) and HENRION-FEHR and F. MORIN, St. Francois et les Franciscains, Paris, 1863. [GAUDENTIUS, Franciscaner Orden im Kampfe gegen den Protestantismus, 1 Bd., Botzen, 1880.]

ZÖCKLER.

FRANCK, Sebastian, b. at Donauworth, 1499; d. at Basel, 1542; was appointed evangelical preacher at Gustenfeld, near Nuremberg, 1525, and afterwards working a printing-press, he published theological, and moral, and religious works. In 1540, he was a leader of the Anabaptists. Dissatisfied with them, too, he separated from them, and determined to belong to no party-church, but to devote his life to a literary representation of the ideal, the truly spiritual church. Sustaining himself and his family, first by running a soap-factory, and afterwards by working a printing-press, he published theological, and moral, and religious works. He was from Strassburg, 1581, the first German world's-history; Weitbuch, Cosmographie, Tübingen, 1584, the first German geography; and a great number of mystical-theological books. — Paradoxa, Die guldene Arch, Das Kriegsbüchlein, etc. But as these books contained very sharp criticisms, not only of the Roman, but also of the Reformed, churches, the author was bitterly persecuted, and driven from place to place. Nevertheless, his books became popular in the true sense of the word, and many of them are still living among the people. See C. A. HASE, Sebastian Franck, der Schreergmeister, Leipzig, 1862.

FRANCKE, August Hermann, b. at Lübeck, March 23, 1683; d. at Halle, June 8, 1727; studied theology at Erfurt, Kiel, and Leipzig, where, together with Paul Anton, he founded the famous Collegium Philobiblicum. The spiritual direction which he gave the Observants, the severer party, was formally recognized by the Council of Constance in its nineteenth sitting (Sept. 23, 1415); and Leo X., after an ineffectual attempt to gather the whole order under one ob-
Epistles of St. Paul in the university of Leipzig, and his lectures attracted extraordinarily great audiences; but in 1690 they were forbidden by the faculty. In that year he was called as preacher to Erfurt, and, when he preached, the church was crowded; but he was suddenly ordered to leave the city within twenty-four hours. In 1691, knowing he had spoken upon the newly-founded university of Halle, first in Oriental languages, and afterwards in theology; and there, the homestead of Pietism, he was allowed to develop all his energy undisturbed and in peace.

[Of his works several have been translated into English, such as *Manuductio ad Lectionem Scripture Socrat.* Halle, 1893, by Jacques, London, 1813; *Nicodemus, a Treatise against the Fear of Man, London, 1709; and Footsteps of Divine Providence, London, 1797.*] But it was less as a writer than as a teacher and practical philanthropist that Francke exercised his great influence. On Nov. 5, 1685, he received an orphan into his house; but, before the month ran out, he had nine, and twelve before New Year. The number steadily increasing, a neighboring house was bought, and, as this also soon proved too small, the foundation was laid, on July 24, 1698, of the Orphan Asylum,—the first and one of the greatest establishments of the kind. In 1695 he also opened a small children's school in his house. In 1698 the school numbered five hundred pupils, eleven hundred in 1709, over two thousand at the death of the master. In the same manner developed the printing-press and publishing establishment, which he connected with the Orphan Asylum: it is now one of the greatest publishing establishments of Germany. For the various foundations of Francke, see *Die Stiftungen A. H. Franckes,* Halle, 1883. An important source for his life and character is **KRAMER: Beiträge zur Geschichte A. H. Franckes,* Halle, 1861; containing his correspondence with Spener; *Neue Beiträge, 1875 [and a Life of Francke, Halle, 1880 sq.]*

A good biography of him is that by **GUERINKE,** Halle, 1827 [Eng. trans., London, 1837]. There are numerous minor sketches on Francke; **KRAMER: Beiträge zur Geschichte A. H. Franckes,* Halle, 1881, containing his correspondence with Spener; *Neue Beiträge, 1875 [and a Life of Francke, Halle, 1880 sq.]*

A good biography of him is that by **GUERINKE,** Halle, 1827 [Eng. trans., London, 1837]. There are numerous minor sketches on Francke; **KRAMER: Beiträge zur Geschichte A. H. Franckes,* Halle, 1881, containing his correspondence with Spener; *Neue Beiträge, 1875 [and a Life of Francke, Halle, 1880 sq.]*

A good biography of him is that by **GUERINKE,** Halle, 1827 [Eng. trans., London, 1837]. There are numerous minor sketches on Francke; **KRAMER: Beiträge zur Geschichte A. H. Franckes,* Halle, 1881, containing his correspondence with Spener; *Neue Beiträge, 1875 [and a Life of Francke, Halle, 1880 sq.]*

A good biography of him is that by **GUERINKE,** Halle, 1827 [Eng. trans., London, 1837]. There are numerous minor sketches on Francke; **KRAMER: Beiträge zur Geschichte A. H. Franckes,* Halle, 1881, containing his correspondence with Spener; *Neue Beiträge, 1875 [and a Life of Francke, Halle, 1880 sq.*]
bloom of the classical civilization; and though for centuries they remained rude and coarse and cruel to the very core of their being, yet so completely did they yield to the mental superiority of the conquered race, that, even before 490, Latinity had become their official language; the language in which their famous law, Lex Salica, was written down. In Gaul the Franks also met with Christianity; and though Chlodvig allowed his men to burn and plunder the Christian churches, he nevertheless stood in great awe of the Christian bishops. In 493 he married Clothilde, a Burgundian princess, and a Christian. Their children were baptized; and Chlodvig, like many of his men, was hesitating with respect to this new and strange religion, when an incident decided his course. He was compelled in 496 to give battle to the Alemanni; and on the issue of this battle depended the very existence of the Frankish Empire in Gaul. But the Franks wavered; and in this emergency Chlodvig made a vow to the God of the Gauls, that, if he gained the victory, he would become a Christian. The victory he gained, and he and many of his men were baptized. But in this and in so many other cases of conversion, the way from the baptism to a thorough Christianization was very long, a distance of several centuries.

FRATERNITIES (Fraternitas, Sodalitas) are associations formed in the Roman-Catholic Church for special religious purposes, such as nursing the sick, supporting the poor, practising some special devotion, etc., but of a less rigorous description than the monastic orders. They have their own statutes, religious exercises, privileges, etc.; but they stand under the authority of the bishops, and are only morally separated from the world. Such a fraternity, dedicated to Mary the Virgin, is mentioned by Odo, Bishop of Paris, about 1208; another, the so-called "Gonfaloni," was confirmed by Clement V., 1285-71. Among the most prominent were those of the Scapularly, the Rosary, Corpus Christi, etc. One, the Fratres Pontifices, was formed for the purpose of procuring good bridges across the water-courses. The fraternities may be divided into four classes. 1. Those which particularly relate to the worship of Christ, such as the fraternities of The Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar, of The Most Holy Heart of Jesus, of The Most Holy Name of Jesus, The Holy Five Wounds, etc. 2. Those which pay particular honor unto the Virgin Mary. They are very numerous. The most famous one, and one of the most celebrated in modern times, is The Fraternity of the Most Holy and Immaculate Heart of Mary for the Conversion of Sinners, founded in Paris, 1857, by Abbé Dufriche Desgenettes. 3. Those formed for the honor of particular saints — very numerous. 4. Those that are charitable.

FRATRICELLI, FRATRICELLI. Wishing to put an end to the split in the Franciscan order, which had prevailed for the larger part of the thirteenth century, Celestine V. authorized the brothers Petrus de Macerata and Petrus de Faro Sepronia, and some other Italian Spirituals, to form an independent congregation under the name of Pauperes Eremitae Domini Celestini. This congregation was heavily persecuted by the rest of the Franciscans, especially Francis of Assisi, and the pope, Benedict VIII.; but, excited by Peter Olivi's apocalyptic prophecies and vehement invectives against the Pope, the hermits, now generally called "Fraticelli," determined to resist. They declared that there had been no true pope since Celestine. They pushed the vow of poverty to the extreme, whereas they were often called "Bizochi," from the Italian bizochì, French besace, a "beggar's sack." They entered into communication with the Beggarks, and taught that they were possessed of the Holy Spirit, and exempt from sin; that they needed neither penitence nor sacraments, etc. An attempt of Clement V. to re-unite the Spirituals with the Franciscans failed in 1312; and meanwhile the Fraticelli grew more and more unmanageable. In 1314 they expelled force by force the Franciscans from the monasteries of Bézier and Narbonne. This caused John XXII. to adopt severer measures against them. In this emergency the Inquisition was ordered to step in. In Italy, Sicily, and Southern France, where they had spread widely, a number of Fraticelli were seized by the Inquisition between 1318 and 1322, condemned, and burnt. only a few were willing to recant.

But after the middle of the fourteenth century they gradually disappeared. By later writers, they, like all heretical sects, have been accused of various abominable vices; but there are no proofs.

C. SCHMIDT.
when Luther, in 1517, nailed his theses on the church-door in Wittenberg, the elector kept quiet; and when the Roman curia, in 1518, demanded that Luther should be sent to Rome to be punished for heresy, the elector refused: yea, when Luther publickly and solemnly burned this same bull, the elector saw no reason why he should interfere. The greatest service, however, which Frederick the Wise did to the cause of the Reformation was the removal of Luther to the Wartburg after the Diet of Worms, probably the only means of protecting him against the Pope and the emperor. There was in this policy,—so firm, so consistent, and yet so cautious,—no doubt, a high political wisdom; but there was also something else. A spark of Luther's conviction had fallen into Frederick's soul; and shortly before he died he took the Lord's Supper under both forms. See TUTTSCOMMANN: Friedrich der Weise, Grimma, 1848; G. SPALATIN: Fried. d. W., ed. by Neudacker and Preller, Jena, 1851; [CARL BUCKER: Das edle sächsische Fürsten-Kleben in, Berlin, 1851; K. SCHMIDT: Wittenberg um Kaiserzeit, Fried. d. Weise, Erlen., 1877; Theodor Kolde: Fried. der Weise u. d. Anfänge d. Reformation, Erlen., 1881].

FREDERICK III., THE PIOUS, Elector of the Palatinate, 1559-76; was educated by Bishop Eberhard of Liege, and at the court of Charles V., but was, nevertheless, early impressed by the ideas of the Reformation. In 1571 he married the Lutheran Princess Maria of Brandenburg-Bayreuth, and in 1549 he openly embraced Lutheranism. On his accession he found the Lutheran Church almost fully established in the Palatinate; but, shortly after, a violent controversy broke out between the Lutheran and the Reformed theologians, concerning the Lord's Supper. Frederick asked Melanchthon to interfere; but the memoir which Melanchthon wrote approached the ideas of Zwinglei or Calvin so closely that Frederick himself was doubtful. The religious disputation in Heidelberg (1560) completed his conversion; and, as his people also seemed inclined to Calvinism, the festivals of Mary and the saints were abolished; the altars, organs, baptismal fonts, images, etc., disappeared from the churches; Calvinists were appointed as teachers and preachers; the government of the church was confided to a council-board, consisting of three ecclesiastical and three lay members, etc. In 1562 appeared the Heidelberg Catechism, written by Ursinus and Olevianus, but under the eyes of the elector himself; and it found so much favor that it immediately was translated into French, English, Dutch, and Latin, and adopted almost by the whole body of the Reformed Church. An attempt was made by the Lutheran princes of the empire to prevent the establishment of Calvinism in the Palatinate; and they too were so bold as to threaten the elector with war and deposition. But at the diet of Augsburg (1563) he met them with such courage and straightforwardness, that the case was dropped. To the end of his life he was a strong support to the Reformed Church, both in France and in the Netherlands. See his life, by KLUCKHOHN (Nordlingen, 1877-79), who has also edited his letters (2 vols., Brunswick, 1868-72).

FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND. See Scotland, Free Church of.

FREE CONGREGATIONS (Friends of Light, Protestant Friends) were formed in Prussia during the fifth decade of the present century as the result of a rationalistic re-action against the revival of positive Christianity. Under the presidency of Ulrich, pastor of Pommelte, near Magdeburg, a number of pastors belonging to the old rationalistic school assembled in 1841, first at Guadan, and then at Halle; agreed upon a platform of nine strongly pronounced rationalistic propositions; adopted the name of Friends of Light, afterwards Protestant Friends; and decided upon the publication of a periodical,—Blätter für christliche Erbauung. At their seventh meeting in London (1845) they firmly declared war against the ecclesiastical establishment, and against all the theologians and about five hundred laymen were present. Ulrich delivered a lecture, in which he openly rejected the doctrines of hereditary sin, atonement, the trinity, the divinity of Christ, and the church. He was followed by Wislicenus, pastor at Halle, and a rationalist of a younger stamp, but of a still deeper dye. The stand-point of Wislicenus was a popularized form of the pantheism of the young Hegelian school; and in his lecture, Ob Schrift? Ob Geist? he broke with the church of which he was a servant, and which establishes Scripture as the rule of faith. The authorities then interfered; and in 1846 Wislicenus separated from the Established Church of Prussia, and formed a free congregation at Halle. Other free congregations were formed by Ulrich at Magdeburg, by Rupp at Königsberg, and at other places, often accompanied with rather tumultuous expressions of enthusiasm. A combination was, however, brought about with the German Catholics in 1847; and in 1848 the leaders of the movement found themselves in the Parliament, and generally in the political arena as the leaders of the nation. But the revolution was not frank enough to set in, a great change took place. While Ulrich, Wislicenus, Rupp, and, indeed, most of the leaders, gradually moved onward from one negation to another, until at last they ended in complete nihilism, without any positive basis at all, teaching a religion without any God, and forming congregations without any faith, the government began to suspect the congregations as political instruments. In Saxony and Bavaria they were completely suppressed; and in Prussia they lived on, only under great difficulties, and affiliating themselves with atheists and materialists. In 1868, however, there were a hundred and twenty-one free congregations in Germany, with about twenty-five thousand members. In the United States of America there are also found some free German congregations,—in Philadelphia, St. Louis, Hoboken,—which mostly act in union, more or less cordial, with the various free-thinker associations. See his life, by KAHNIS.

FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION, established in Boston, Mass., May 30, 1867, aims at the emancipation of religion from all sectarian limits, the reconciliation of faiths, and the application of the scientific method to the study of
theology. Mr. O. B. Frothingham was the first
president. Each member holds and defends in
their meetings those views upon the various sub-
jects which come before the association which he
deems true. The utmost liberty of opinion is
given. The elastic nature of the organization,
for "any person desiring to co-operate" is "con-
sidered a member," renders exact statistics im-
possible. Up to this time (1882) the associa-
tion has not attempted to organize local societies,
but contented itself with holding conventions,
and distributing publications. From 1867 to
1880 the Annual Report was issued in pamphlet
form: since then it has been published in the
Index of Boston, Mass.

FREE SPIRIT, Brethren of. See Brethren
of the Free Spirit.

FREETHINKERS, a general designation de-
noting a class of writers and thinkers who deny
the truth of revealed religion. The term was
applied to all "freethinkers," such as Toland and
Bentley, by Locke. The term "freethinker," as a
name or title, was first given to a single writer,
Philemon Holland, in 1681. The name is often
used in a broad sense for all rationalism and
infidelity. See A. S. Farrar, Hist. of Free
Thought (Bampton Lectures), Lond., 1863. See
Deism.

FREEWILL BAPTISTS, a denomination of
American Christians who baptize by immersion,
and are Arminian in doctrine.

History. — The first Freewill-Baptist Church
was organized at New Durham, N. H., in 1780, by
Benjamin Randall (1749-1808). Converted under
the preaching of Whitefield, Randall joined the
Baptist Church. In 1779 he was called to account
for holding to an unlimited atonement and the
freedom of the will, and was disfellowshipped.
He was ordained in 1780, and at once began to
propagate his views. A sect with similar tenets
had been organized in 1751, in North Carolina,
under the preaching of Shubael Stearns, and was
continuously active. In 1806 Randall's followers
continued to claim to be Baptists; but the claim
was repudiated by the original Baptists, who called them "Freewill-
ers," —a designation which they themselves sub-
sequently adopted. In 1827 the first General
Conference was held; and the body has ex-
tended to Canada, New Brunswick, and Nova
Scotia.

Doctrine and Polity. — The Freewill Baptists
agree in all the fundamental Christian doctrines
with other evangelical denominations. With the
regular Baptists they practise baptism by im-
mersion. They differ from the Baptists on the
questions of predestination, the extent of the
atonement, and the ability of the sinner to repent.
On these points their Book of Faith thus ex-
presses the views of the denomination: "God has
ordained man with power of free choice, and gov-
sers him by moral laws and motives; and this
power of free choice is the exact measure of his
responsibility. All events are present with God
from everlasting to everlasting; but his know-
ledge of them does not in any sense cause them,
nor does he decree all events which he knows will
occur" (chap. iii. 2, 3). "The call of the Gospel
is co-extensive with the atonement to all men,
both by word and the strivings of the Spirit: so
that salvation is rendered equally possible to all;
and, if any fail of eternal life, the fault is wholly
their own" (chap.viii.). While they hold to
regeneration, they deny the doctrine of the perse-
verance of saints. The Freewill Baptists differ
also from the Baptists in practising open
common

The church has an ordained ministry, and here-
tofore individual churches have ordained minis-
ters; but the Conference of 1880 deprecated this
practice, and called upon the churches to proceed
on such occasions with the advice of the Quarterly
Meetings. The church adopts a form of govern-
ment intermediate between the Congregational
and the Presbyterian. The individual churches
are independent organizations, governed by elders
and deacons, and alone have authority over their
members. There is no court of appeal for the
churches of the association, but only for the Con-
ference. The Quarterly Meeting is composed of
two or more ministers voluntarily bound together.
The Yearly Meeting is composed of two or more
Quarterly Meetings, and the "General Confer-
ence of the Freewill-Baptist Connection" is com-
pounded of delegates from the Yearly Meetings
and assembles every three years, in the month of Oc-
tober. Each of these associations may "labor
with" the next lower down to the church "as a
body;" but neither has appellate jurisdiction.

Statistics. — The Freewill Baptist Register and
Year-Book for 1886 (Boston, 1886) gives the fol-
lowing numbers: churches 1,490, ordained minis-
ters 1,562, communicants 77,827. Almost one-half
of their strength (or 36,000 members) is concen-
trated in New England. The denomination is
much stronger in Maine, where it has 273 churches
and 15,420 communicants, than in any other State.
The denomination maintains flourishing institu-
tions at Lewiston, Me. (Bates College), and Hills-
dale, Mich.; also has colleges at Ridgeville, Ind.,
and Rio Grande, O.; and maintains a mission in
India, with eight missionaries and four assistants.
The Freewill or Free Baptists numbered in 1885
11,604 members in New Brunswick, and 3,600 in
Nova Scotia. See Stewart: History of the Free
Baptists (from 1780 to 1830), Dover, 1862;
A Treatise on the Faith and Practice of the Free-
will Baptists, Dover, 1871; Freewill-Baptist Regis-
ter and Year-Book, 1886.

FREEMAN, James, D.D., pastor of the first Unit-
ar Church of New England; b. in Charlestown,
Mass., April 22, 1759; d. at Newton, Mass.,
Nov. 14, 1835. Graduating at Harvard College
in 1777, he was called to King's Chapel, then an
Episcopal Church, Boston, as a tutor, in 1782.
He gave up the belief in the Trinity,stein, and
refused ordination by the bishop, was ordained
pastor by his church (1787), which adopted his
views. Thus the oldest Episcopal Church in
New England became the first Unitarian Church
of America. Dr. Freeman was a man of fine
social qualities and much power in the pulpit.
He was one of the founders of the Massachusetts
Historical Society, and in 1822 published a vol-
ume of Sermons and Addresses. See Ware:
Unitarian Biog.; and Sprague's Annals, viii. 162.

FRELINGHUYSEN, Hon. Theodore, b. at Mill-
stone, Somerset County, N.J., March 28, 1757;
d. at New Brunswick, N.J., April 12, 1861. He was graduated with the highest honors at Nassau Hall 1804; called to the bar 1808. From 1817 to 1829 he was attorney-general of New Jersey; served a term in the United States Senate, during which he delivered many eloquent speeches, and displayed in the highest stations his earnest Christian character. He heartily supported all acts tending to ameliorate the condition of the poor and oppressed, or to elevate their moral or religious character. He advocated bills for the improvement of the condition of the Indian tribes, and the suppression of Sunday mails. When his term was ended, he resumed his practice. In 1837 and 1838 he was mayor of Newark, N.J. In 1839 he became chancellor of the University of the City of New York, from which office he went in 1850 to the presidency of Rutgers' College, New Brunswick, N.J., and held it until death. In 1844 he was an unsuccessful candidate for the United States on the ticket with Henry Clay for President. At one time he was president of the American Bible Society, the American Tract Society, and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. "His eloquent tongue was ever ready to plead for every good Christian or humane cause." He was one of the most distinguished Christian laymen of his day. See his Memoir, by the Rev. T. W. Chambers, D.D., N.Y., 1863.

FRENCH CONFESSION OF FAITH. See GALICAN CONFESSION.

FRENCH PROPHETS were Camisards (see art.), who appeared in England in 1706, and prophesied the speedy establishment of the Messiah's kingdom. For a time they produced a great impression, and won the allegiance of distinguished men, among whom was John Lacey, who, although previously a member of Dr. Calamy's congregation, "entered into all their absurdities, except that of a community of goods, to which he strongly objected, having an income of two thousand pounds per annum." But these prophets overreached themselves by their fanaticism, even going so far as to lose one of their number, lately deceased, would rise from the dead upon a certain day. Failure in this and other predictions weakened their hold even on the credulous, and their little day ended in disgrace. See Hughson: A Copious Account of the French and English Prophets, London, 1814.

FRENCH PROTESTANTISM. See France, Protestantism in.

FRENCH VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE. See Bible Versions, p. 288.

FRESNÉ, DU. See Du Canet.

FREYLINGHAUSEN, Johann Anastasius, one of the principal hymnists and leaders of the Pietistic movement in Germany: b. at Gandersheim, near Wolfenbüttel, in Hanover, Dec. 2, 1760; d. at Halle, Feb. 12, 1799. He received from his mother a strictly pious though legalistic education; studied theology at Jena, 1789; became acquainted with Augustus Herman Francke, the founder of the Orphan House at Halle, married his only daughter, Anastasia, and succeeded him in 1727. In connection with him and Spener he labored for the revival of practical piety in Germany. He combined the activity of an academic teacher, pastor, and superintendent of the benevolent institutions at Halle, and exerted a very salutary influence upon the rising generation. His theological works, of which the Fundamental Theology (Grundlegung der Theologie, 1703) deserves to be mentioned, are not distinguished for any vigor or depth of thought, but for their piety and practical tendency, in opposition to the dry and cold scholasticism which then prevailed in the German universities. His most valuable productions are forty-four hymns, pregnant with Scripture truth, and fervent love to the Saviour. Some of them have passed into common use, and found a place in every good German hymn-book; as, "Wer ist wohl wie du, Jesu süsse Ruh," "Jesus ist kommen, Grund ewiger Freuden," "Mein Herz gieb dich zufrieden," etc. [See translations in Miss Catharine Winkworth's Lyra Germanica, first and second series.]

Freylinghausen published also during his life the best German hymn-books, in 2 vols., Halle, 1704 and 1713. The historical significance of this collection consists in its pietistic spirit, and the introduction of the element of subjective devotion as a supplement to the older, more objective, and churchly hymns of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.


FRIEDOLIN or FRIDOLD (also Tridolin or Trudolin, often styled the "First Apostle of Allemania," and still venerable in the diocese of Klaas, a native of Scotland, and preached Christianity to his heathen countrymen, but repaired afterwards to Poitiers, where he restored the church and congregation of St. Hilary (ruined and corrupted under the

FRIDOLIN or FRIDOLD (also Tridolin or Trudolin, often styled the "First Apostle of Allemania," and still venerable in the diocese of Klaas, a native of Scotland, and preached Christianity to his heathen countrymen, but repaired afterwards to Poitiers, where he restored the church and congregation of St. Hilary (ruined and corrupted under the
influence of Arikanism) to their former splendor and purity. Moved by a vision of St. Hilary, he set out for Alemania, and received from Chlodvig an island in the Rhine (Säckingen), where he built a church, and founded a monastery, and where he died. All that is known of Friedolin is drawn from Life of him written by Balther, a monk of Säckingen, and dedicated to Notker Labeo of St. Gallen, who died 1022; but as this Life is written four centuries after the time of Friedolin, as it presents several chronological difficulties, and is much embellished with legendary ornament, the historical foundation it furnishes is rather slim. The best edition of it is found in Monk: Quellensammlung d. badischen Landesgeschichte, Carlsruhe, 1845, vol. I. See Gelpke: Kirchengeschichte d. Schweiz, Bern, 1856; Heber: Die vorkaroling.christlich.Glaubenshelden, Gettigen, 1867; Eberard: Die trostch. Missionarikirche, Gütersloch, 1873.

FRIENDLY ISLANDS. This group, discovered by Tasman, 1643, and named by Capt. Cook, on account of their friendly demeanor towards him, lies in the Southern Pacific, two hundred and fifty miles south-east of the Fiji group. It consists of a hundred and fifty islands with an area of four hundred square miles. The islands are mostly of coral formation, some of them, however, of volcanic origin. Tonga, the largest, is twenty-one by twelve miles, and Vavau, the second in size, is forty-two miles in circumference. In 1847 the missionaries estimated the population to be fifty thousand. It does not now exceed twenty or twenty-five thousand. These islanders were excellent seamen, and frequently visited the Fiji group to procure wood for the manufacture of boats. They were superior in intelligence to the Fijians, but, with them, cannibals, and far sunken in iniquity. The first missionaries went to them in 1797, of whom several were murdered, and the rest retired in 1800. In 1825 the Wesleyan Missionary Society undertook missionary work amongst them in concert. In 1831 a revival of great power passed over the islands. King George Tubou was converted, and became an active Christian worker, often occupying the pulpit himself. A great change took place in the habits of the people. Slavery has been utterly abolished; the language has been reformed; writing, schools are scattered through the islands, and education is compulsory. The Christians of the islands early sent missionaries to the Fiji group. In 1839 the contributions of the native churches were £5,689, £3,000 of which were devoted to benevolent and missionary purposes. One of the last reports gave 126 churches, 8,800 communicants, and 17,000 attendants on church. Lit.—Mariner: Account of the Natives of the Tonga Islands, 2 vols., Lond., 1813; Rev. T. West: Ten Years in South Central Polynesia; Williams and Calvert: Fiji and the Fijians, and Missionary Labors among the Cannibals, etc., Lond., 1870, 3d ed.

FRIENDS. Society of. The rise of this body of Christians is one of the most noteworthy events in the religious history of England in the seventeenth century. In the midst of the efforts that were made to rescue the Church from the corruptions which had grown up around it, there were men who felt that Luther and Cranmer had not gone far enough, and that there was still muchacerdotalism to be purged away, before the original simplicity of Christianity could be restored. Such men found a leader in George Fox. He and his followers announced as their aim the revival of primitive Christianity; and this phrase remains as the best definition of their work. The privilege of direct access to God, without the intervention of human priest or rite, was revealed to Fox's soul. Having found one, "even Christ Jesus, who could speak to his condition," he longed to impart his discovery of the spirituality of true religion to others, and in 1647 began his labors in public ministry, going forth through England on foot, and at his own charges. His message appears to have been mainly to direct the people to the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls, who died for them, and had sent his spirit into their hearts, to instruct and guide them in the things pertaining to life and salvation. "I was sent," he says, "to turn people from darkness to the light, that they might receive Christ Jesus; for, to as many as should receive him, two hundred and forty-two miles in circumference. In 1847 the missionaries estimated the population to be fifty thousand. It does not now exceed twenty or twenty-five thousand. These islanders were excellent seamen, and frequently visited the Fiji group to procure wood for the manufacture of boats. They were superior in intelligence to the Fijians, but, with them, cannibals, and far sunken in iniquity. The first missionaries went to them in 1797, of whom several were murdered, and the rest retired in 1800. In 1825 the Wesleyan Missionary Society undertook missionary work amongst them in concert. In 1831 a revival of great power passed over the islands. King George Tubou was converted, and became an active Christian worker, often occupying the pulpit himself. A great change took place in the habits of the people. Slavery has been utterly abolished; the language has been reformed; writing, schools are scattered through the islands, and education is compulsory. The Christians of the islands early sent missionaries to the Fiji group. In 1839 the contributions of the native churches were £5,689, £3,000 of which were devoted to benevolent and missionary purposes. One of the last reports gave 126 churches, 8,800 communicants, and 17,000 attendants on church. Lit.—Mariner: Account of the Natives of the Tonga Islands, 2 vols., Lond., 1813; Rev. T. West: Ten Years in South Central Polynesia; Williams and Calvert: Fiji and the Fijians, and Missionary Labors among the Cannibals, etc., Lond., 1870, 3d ed.

FRIENDS. Society of. The rise of this body of Christians is one of the most noteworthy events in the religious history of England in the seventeenth century. In the midst of the efforts that were made to rescue the Church from the corruptions which had grown up around it, there were men who felt that Luther and Cranmer had
when Mary Fisher and Anne Austin arrived in Boston from Barbadoes, to which island they had gone to preach the gospel the preceding year. They were charged with holding "very dangerous, heretical, and blasphemous opinions," and were kept in close confinement, at first on the vessel, and afterwards in jail. Their books were burned, by the court, and the persons searched to discover signs of witchcraft. They were then sent back to Barbadoes. In 1660 this same Mary Fisher held an interview with Sultan Mahomet IV., at Adrianople, where he was then encamped with his army. Two days after the banishment of the first Friends from Boston, a vessel having on board eight other Friends arrived from London. They were at once imprisoned, and, eleven weeks afterwards, sent back to England. But, nothing daunted, others of the same faith continued to arrive in New England, to suffer scourging, imprisonment, barbarous punishments, and, in four of their number (William Robinson and Marmaduke Stevenson in 1659, Mary Dyer in 1660, and William Leddra in 1661), death by the gallows. Monthly Meetings had been established in New England before 1660, and in 1661 a Yearly Meeting on Rhode Island, which has been kept up regularly to the present date. New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas were visited very early; and, although there was much persecution, flourishing communities of Friends sprung up. George Fox himself made an extended journey in America in 1671-73. But the most important event in the early history of the society on this continent was the settlement of Pennsylvania by William Penn and a large number of his brethren in faith, beginning in 1682. In 1690 there were about ten thousand Friends in the American Colonies.

While no Friends in England suffered immediate martyrdom, the sum of their persecution was most severe. Between the years 1650 and 1689 fourteen thousand of them were fined and imprisoned; and three hundred and sixty-nine, including the majority of the first preachers, died in jail, "by malevolent mockings, burdens, imprisonments, and afflictions innumerable." Never were persecutions borne in a more heroic spirit of endurance, or in a more Christian spirit of forgiveness. Never, too, were the inalienable rights of conscience more bravely asserted, and the privileges of Englishmen more boldly claimed. "The trials of the Friends, and especially that of John Crook in 1682, and that of William Penn and William Mead in 1670, at the Old Bailey, will forever remain as noble monuments of their resistance to the arbitrary proceedings of the courts of judicature at that time, and the intolerable rigour of the deistical and civil juries." Soon after the Revolution of 1688, the persecution ceased on both sides of the Atlantic.

When the martyr age had passed, the society became less aggressive, and made fewer converts to its views; but it devoted itself to the quiet practice of all the Christian virtues, and to an ascetic philosophy, the practice of which was to be in all the churches. An exaggerated asceticism in some directions, and a rigid, though in most respects an admirable, discipline, visiting with excommunication even the offence of marrying a person not a member of the society, co-operated to keep it numerically small. But it has always exerted a power, in the church at large and in the community, far beyond what was to be expected from its numbers. In the recognition of the equal rights of women, in the abolition of slavery and the slave-trade, in the protection and advancement of the weaker, and in the weakness of mankind, in the amelioration of penal laws and prison discipline, in the adoption of enlightened methods for the care and relief of the insane, in testimony against war, intemperance, oaths, corrupting books and amusements, extravagance, insincerity, and vain display, it has been in the forefront of Christian reformers; while it has maintained the highest standard of integrity and practical virtue, and in the everyday charities of life its bounty has been unstinted.

About the year 1827 the society in America was divided into two bodies—evangelical or "orthodox," and liberal or "licksite," each of which claims to be the true representative of the early Friends. The orthodox society is the one acknowledged as genuine by the London Yearly Meeting. A tone of thought similar to that prevailing in the evangelical section of the Church of England was fostered by the preaching and writings of Joseph John Gurney (1788-1847), and had great influence on both sides of the Atlantic. This school of opinion found an opponent in the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, which claims to maintain the truths taught by the founders, against perversion on either hand; but it has been very influential in the society at large. An earnest school is now arising, holding the essential doctrines of orthodox faith, and animated with an increased zeal for education and for the growth of the church, while discarding formalities of dress and speech, and all undue asceticism.

Distinctive Creed. — The creed of the Society of Friends may be described, as, from the first, one singularly free both from heresy and from exaggeration. Objecting to scholastic terms and "man-made" symbols, the Friends endeavor to address by Fox and others to the Governor of Barbadoes in 1671. What is most distinctive of the society is its belief in the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, and its expectation of the guidance of the Spirit in worship and all religious acts. This might degenerate into mysticism, were it not corrected by the society's full recognition of the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures, by which they admit it, in the words of Barclay, "as a positive certain maxim, that whatsoever any do, pretending to the Spirit, which is contrary to the Scriptures, should be accounted and reckoned a delusion of the Devil."

Their belief in the spirituality of Christianity has led them, also, to the disuse of the outward rites of baptism and the Lord's Supper, while they fully believe in the necessity of spiritual baptism, and the privation of communion with the Father and the Son, through the Holy Spirit. They do not find, in the texts ordinarily understood as establishing these rites, any indication of such intention, and regard the
rites themselves as inconsistent with the whole spirit of Christianity, in which types have given place to the substance. Their views in regard to the ministry are also characteristic. They believe that no one should preach the Word without a direct call from God, and that this call must come to male or female. No high human learning and no course of theological study are necessary qualifications for a minister, who may be as unlettered as were most of the apostles, if plenteously ended with heavenly grace. But Friends do not deny the self-evident proposition, that learning and intellectual ability conduce to the usefulness of a preacher of the gospel, and that a church needs men possessing both, to assert and defend the truth. Any one who feels it laid upon him is allowed to speak in the meetings for worship, so long as he speaks things worthy of the occasion. If, after sufficient probation, he gives evidence of a divine call, he is formally acknowledged as a minister, and is allowed one of the seats at the head of the meeting. Besides ministers, the society appoints elders, whose especial duty is to sympathize with and advise ministers, and watch that they be sound in the faith; and overseers, as in the primitive church, who have a general care of the flock. In meetings for business, the society recognizes the presidency of the great Head of the Church, and strives to do all in his fear, and with his guidance. Decisions are not made by votes and majorities, but are recorded by the clerk, in accordance with what appears to be "the weight" of either side; or, if there is not a general spirit of acquiescence, action is postponed.

Worship and Ministry.—Believing that every act of divine service should proceed from an immediate impression of duty, prompted by the Holy Spirit, the meetings of the society for worship are held in silence, unless some one feels called upon to preach or teach, to offer prayer in behalf of the congregation, or to give praise to the Most High. But this silence is itself intended to be occupied with religious acts. Highest of these is the direct communion of the soul with its Maker and its Lord, in rapt devotion, in thanksgiving and prayer. But there are services, in these hours of silence, adapted to every degree of religious experience and every serious mood of mind. One of the most profitable of these is self-examination. As in the sight of the All-Seeing Eye, the humble worshipper recounts his thoughts and deeds, confesses his sins, supplicates for pardon for the past and strength for the future, and prays that he may be cleansed even from secret faults. Another exercise is religious meditation. At worst, every attender can force himself to think on profitable themes by repeating to himself texts of Scripture, or the verses of some suggestive hymn. "Sometimes a light surprises" the humble worshipper; his thoughts are led on upward by a higher Power; new meanings of texts flash upon his mind, a new illumination is given to the path of duty, and in answer to the prayer of his soul he feels conscious of a closer union with God, and strengthened for his future warfare with the world, the flesh, and the devil. And, if some brother or sister is led to offer vocal service, it often happens that the word of exhortation or reproof or comfort, or the earnest petition to the throne of grace, harmonizes with the private exercise of mind which the hearer has passed through, confirming his faith, and invigorating his resolution.

The theory of the exercise of the ministry among Friends asserts the prompting and guidance of the Holy Spirit, both what to say, and when to say it. It does not, however, intelligently understood, claim any infallibility, or plenary inspiration, in the speaker. The treasure is borne in earthen vessels, and the imperfections of the instrument may sometimes appear. Yet he that lives daily near his Lord, and is careful not to assert more than he has tested in his own experience, or to utter words beyond those in which he feels a full consciousness of divine leading; seldom outruns his Guide, or fails to speak to the edification of the church.

Education.—The society provides that all its members shall receive a good practical education, and cherishes also the higher learning. It has colleges at Haverford, Penn., Richmond, Ind., Wilmington, O., and Oakalcoosa, I.o., and one for girls at Bryn Mawr, Penn. There are excellent boarding schools in most of the Yearly Meetings.

Organization.—The congregations are grouped together to constitute Monthly, Quarterly, and Yearly Meetings: the Monthly Meetings sending representatives to the Quarterly, and the Quarterly to the Yearly. Each Yearly Meeting is an independent body, but united with all the others by a common faith. There are two Yearly Meetings in Great Britain, and ten in America. The number of members is about twenty thousand in Great Britain, and eighty thousand on this continent. Besides these, there is a large number of regular attenders of Friends' meetings, sympathizing with their views.

Hicksites (so called). There are six Yearly Meetings of this body, all in America, with about forty thousand members. They have a flourishing college for both sexes at Swarthmore, near Philadelphia. (See Hicks, Elias.)

Nearly driven out of the country together with the Franks. But Charlemagne treated the Frisians as he treated the Saxons. The country was made a province of the Frankish empire, a branch of the Christian Church. Bishops with liturgy, schools, jurisdiction, and tithes were settled in the country; and all became quiet, though remnants of rank heathenism were still glimmering among the dark, impenetrable forests that covered the country until the twelfth century. They did not constitute a sect; on the contrary, they attended the church-services assiduously, but gave novel interpretations to the ecclesiastical symbols. Their centres were at Cologne, Straßburg, and Basel: their teachers were mostly Dominicans. Their ideas and principles were drawn from the German mystics. They held more or less personal and epistolary communication with one another, especially with the members of the same local society. They protested against the corruptions of the times, and set an example of holy living. Their great leader, however, was Nicholas of Basel: their preacher was John Tauler. (See those articles.) In 1380 some of the more earnest of them assembled in the mountains, according to an agreement made the year before; but, being warned that the explosion of divine wrath would not come for three years, they disbanded, and no later meeting is recorded. See Essays upon the Gottesfreunde, by C. Schmidt (1854) and Rieger (1879).

FRITH (or FRYTH), John, an English Reformer and martyr; b. at Sevenoaks, Kent, about 1503; d. at the stake, July 4, 1533. He studied at Cambridge, and was selected by Cardinal Wolsey to be a member of the college (now Christ Church) at Oxford, which he had recently founded from the spoils of several monasteries. In 1525 he became acquainted with Tyndale, and in his intercourse with him imbibed those evangelical sentiments for which he afterwards died. At Oxford he was imprisoned, with several companions, by the Romanists, for his attachment to the views of Luther and Zwingli. In 1528 he retired to the Continent, having escaped from prison, into which he had been thrown with the connivance of Wolsey. He remained abroad for two years. Returning to England, Frith was a marked man. Sir Thomas More had replied to a sharp attack against the ecclesiastical establishments of England (The Supplication of the Beggar) in a work entitled The poor seely (simple) souls peached out of purgatory. Frith published, in answer to More's work, Disputacon of Purgatory, in which he denies all efficacy to papal indulgences, and maintains that Christ's satisfaction is sufficient, and precludes the necessity of purgatorial cleansing. The author was forthwith confined in the Tower. The authorities were disposed, however, to deal leniently with him. But he not only persisted in his views on purgatory, but wrote in prison a treatise on the Lord's Supper, in which he denied transubstantiation. He was tried, and condemned by Dr. Stokesly, Bishop of London, to the stake. He was burned at Smithfield, in company with Andrew Hewet, a tailor's apprentice, who professed the same views of the Lord's Supper.

Frith was regarded as an able and learned man by his contemporaries. He was the first English martyr for the true doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and the first of the Reformers of England to write against transubstantiation. Besides the treatises already mentioned, he put forth a tract on Baptism, and A Mirror or Glass to know thyself. His writings are published in vol. iii. of the Writings of the Engl. Fathers, London (Ryland Tract Soc.). For his life, see that volume, and Foxe's Acts and Monuments.

FRITZSCHE, Karl Friedrich August, b. at Steinbach, near Borna, Dec. 16, 1801; d. at Giessen, Dec. 6, 1840; studied theology at Leipzig; was appointed professor at Rostock, 1828, and removed to Giessen, 1840. As a philologist, he applied the philological principles of his master to biblical exegesis, and thereby promoted a more exact grammatical interpretation.
FORMENT, Antoine, b. at Trier, near Grenoble, 1509 or 1510; d. in Geneva at an unknown date, but after 1574; entered early into relations with Faber Stapulensis, Marguerite of Navarre, Farel, and the whole party of Reformers, and exercised considerable influence on the reformatory movement in its beginning. In 1532 he labored at Aigle, in 1536 at Tavannes, in 1531 at Bienne and Grandson. In 1532 he arrived at Geneva. As it was not possible to preach the Reformation there openly, he established a school, and advertised that he would teach everybody, young or old, man or woman, to read and write that was in 1533 in one month. People crowded to the school, where they were taught, not only reading and writing, but also the new religion; and in 1533 Froment preached publicly in the market-place. But he was immediately driven out of the city by the Roman priests. He returned, however, a month later, but caused a tremendous uproar by protesting in the very church against the invectives and slander of the priests, and was again compelled to flee from the city. This time, however, he returned, backed by an embassy from the canton of Bern; and in 1535 the council granted permission to preach the Reformation in the city. In the presence of Viret, Farel, and Calvin, Froment naturally re- treated into the background; and the latter part of his life was much troubled. His wife proved untrue to him, and he was compelled to leave the clerical state. He became a notary, and even a member of the council; but his domestic troubles seem to have affected his moral character. His life became disorderly; and in 1562 he was dismissed from the council, and banished from the city. After ten years of exile and misery, the old man was allowed to return to Geneva, and in 1571 he was re-instated as a notary. His principal work is Les actes et gestes merveilleux de la cité de Genève (edited by Gustave Revilliod, Geneva, 1864), a work full of freshness and vivacity, but not fully reliable. There is no independent biography of him, but numerous sketches of his life in La France Protestante, Gabaret, Histoire de l'église de Genèse, etc.

TEODOR SCHOTT.

FRONTON LE DUC (Ducours), b. at Bordeaux, 1558; d. in Paris, Sept. 25, 1624; entered the Society of Jesus in 1577; taught rhetoric and theology at Pout à Mousson, Bordeaux, and Paris, and was in 1604 made librarian of the royal library. Besides editions with notes, and Latin translation of Chrysostom, John of Damascus, Irenaeus, Gregory of Nyssa, Basil etc., he published a number of polemical and apologetical works, of which a list is given by Hâcker, in Bibliographie des écrivains de la Compagnie de Jesus.

FROSSARD, Benjamin Sigismond, b. at Nyon, in Switzerland, 1754; d. at Montauban, 1830; studied theology at Geneva; was appointed pastor of the Reformed Church at Lyons, 1777, and professor of morals in the Ecole Centrale de Clermont-Ferrand, 1792. In 1808 he was charged with the organization of a Protestant theological faculty in Montauban, of which he himself became dean, and professor of morals. Besides translations of Hugh Blair, Wilberforce, etc., he published La Cause des Eclaves Nègres (1788, 2 vols.), which attracted great attention in France.

FROUDE, Richard Hurrell, an ardent supporter of the Oxford movement; b. at Montauban, 1754; d. at Ramsgate, 1839. He was educated at Eton and Oxford; elected fellow of Oriel College, 1826; and ordained priest, 1829. During the last four years of his life he resided in Southern Europe and the West Indies. He was a man of fair talents and a love of the pure and good, but of gloomy temper and ungracious nature, as his mother's letters expressly testify. He fell in heartily with the Tractarian movement. "Really I hate the Reformation more and more," he says. And again: "I think people are injudicious who talk against the Roman Catholics for worshipping the Virgin and images." He was very bitter in his judgment of Milton and the Puritans. To a friend he writes, "Try to un-Protestantize and un-Miltonize Southey and Wordsworth." His Remains, consisting of sermons, letters, journals, etc., appeared in 2 vols., 1838, 1839. He was a brother of the well-known historian. See Newman's Apologia, also Tractarianism.

FRUCTUOUSUS, the apostle of the Sueves and Lusitanians, Archbishop of Braga, in Galicia, since 656; d. about 670; was educated in the monastery school of Palencia, and sold his estates in order to get money for the foundation of monasteries, of which he had built no less than seven, in Lusitania, Asturia, and Galicia, up to 647; and he continued building to his death. There exist two sets of rules written down by him for his monks. The first (Regula Complutensis) is based on the rule of St. Benedict, and written for the monks of Complutum (not the famous place in Castile, the present Alcala, but a place of the same name, probably in Asturia or Leon). It fixes the life of the monks in the minutest details, but not fully reliable. Not only the monks but also the clergy were required to speak without the permission of the superior, but they were even forbidden to turn their heads, or rise from their seats, unless on a given signal. The other (Regula Communis) regards cases in which a whole family entered a monastery. All family ties were immediately dissolved, and all the property appropriated by the monasteries. Both rules are given by Holsten-Brockie, in Cod. reg. monasticorum, II. See Montalembert: Monks of the West, II.

ZOCKLER.

FRUMENTIUS. See ABYSINIAN CHURCH.

FRY, Elizabeth, an eminent philanthropist, daughter of John Gurney, a Friend; was b. near Norwich, Eng., May 21, 1780; d. at Ramsgate, Oct. 13, 1845. She was of fascinating manners, and manifested little interest in religious matters until her eighteenth year. At twenty she married Jose de la Compagnie de Jesus. At the death of her father, in 1809, she spoke for the first time in public, and was soon recognized as a minister among the Friends. Her attention being drawn in 1813, by a report of Friends, to the wretched condition of criminals in the jails, she visited the prison at Newgate. "The fifth.
the closeness of the rooms, the ferocious manners and expressions of the women toward each other, and the sound of the breaths which every thing bespake, are quite indescribable," were her own words in describing what she had seen.

Mrs. Fry at once instituted measures for the amelioration of prison morals and life, daily visiting the prison, reading to the prisoners the Scripture, and writing to them. She found the condition of the criminals. Riot, licentiousness, and filth were exchanged for order, sobriety, and comparative neatness of person. Previously many who had entered the prison only comparatively abandoned, left completely debauched. Now the process was reversed, and many profligate characters went out of the prison renewed. The mayor and aldermen early took notice of these labors, and acknowledged their beneficence.

In 1818, in company with her brother, J. J. Gurney, Mrs. Fry visited the prisons of Northern England and Scotland, and in 1827 those of Ireland. Kindred societies for the help of female criminals were organized in other parts of Great Britain; and the fame of her labors attracted her interest, and stimulated the competition, of women in foreign lands. In 1839, 1840, and 1841 she visited the Continent, extending her labors as far as Hungary. She found the condition of the prisons lamentable. In Hungary many of the criminals slept in stocks, and whipping was universally practised, even to bastinadoing. Her example and immediate efforts secured remedial legislation, and the organization of prison-reform societies in Holland, Denmark, France, Prussia, and other Continental countries. In the mean while her efforts secured the organization of a society (1839) for the care of the criminals after their discharge from prison, and for the visitation of the vessels that carried the convicts to the colonies.

Mrs. Fry did not confine her labors to prison reform. She successfully prosecuted a plan to supply coast vessels and seamen's hospitals with liberal private donations which enabled her and the society to distribute 52,464 volumes among 620 libraries (report for 1836). After several years of growing feebleness, she died at Ramsgate, full of faith, and interested, to the very hour of her departure, in labors of charity for the seamen. A fitting memorial was erected to her in the Elizabeth Fry Refuge. Mrs. Fry was a woman of even temper, great practical skill, tenderness of heart, and deep knowledge of Scripture. Her maxim was "Charity to the soul is the soul of charity," and Sir James Mackintosh highly characterized her as the "female Howard." See Lives of Mrs. Fry by Timpson (London, 1847) and Corner (London, 1853), also Journal and Letters, edited by her daughter, London, 1847.

FULBERT OF CHARTRES, b. about 950; d. April 10, 1029; was educated by Bishop Odol; was elected Bishop of Chartres in 1007. He left, besides some hymns and minor essays, a hundred and thirty-eight letters, which are of great interest for the history of his time, and are found in Migne: Patrol. Lat., vol. 141.

FULCHER OF CHARTRES was chaplain to Baldwin, the second king of Jerusalem, and wrote Gesta peregrinantium Francorum, a history of the Crusaders up to 1127. The best edition of it is that by Duchesne, in Script. Hist. Franc., Tom. IV.

FULCO, minister of Neufly, near Paris, and one of the most popular preachers of his time; d. 1202; seems to have led a rather supercilious life of pleasure until a great change suddenly took place with him in 1192. He went every week-day to Paris to study under Peter Cantor; and the sermons he delivered on Sundays began to attract the greatest attention. Soon he preached, not only in the church, but also in the market-place, not only in Neufly, but also in Paris and all the great cities of France. In 1192 he was charged by Innocent III. with preaching the fourth crusade; and at the chapter-general of the Cistercians, in 1201, he asserted that more than two hundred thousand had received the cross from his hands. Of most importance, however, was, perhaps, the influence he exercised on his own colleagues, whom his words and example led to a more conscientious fulfilment of the duties of their office. See Jacob a Vitriaco and Otton de St. Blasio, in Recueil des Historiens de la France, vol. xviii.; Geoffrey de Ville-Har-douin: Chronique de la prise de Constantinople, and in Buchon: Coll. des chroniques nationales francaises, vol. iii.

FULDA. The Monastery of, was founded in 744, by St. Boniface, who lies buried there. The place was selected by Sturm, a pupil of Boniface; the ground was given by Duke Karlmann; the internal organization was adopted from Monte Casino and the rule of St. Benedict. In 754 the Pope sanctioned the institution, and exempted the abbey from episcopal authority, placing it immediately under the papal see. The first abbot was Sturm; and before his death, in 779, the number of monks had been doubled. New donations were given by Pepin and Charlemagne; and under the leadership of Rabanus Maurus, himself a pupil of Fulda, the school became the centre, not only of learning, but of general progress and civilization in Germany. It gave instruction in theology, grammar, rhetoric, dialectics, mathematics, physics, and astronomy. Among its pupils were Walafrid Strabo, Servatius Lupus, Otfrid, etc. It also cultivated the arts. Isambert, Rudolf, Candidus, Hatto, and others of its monks, were celebrated artists; and great numbers of well-trained artisans, weavers, tanners, carpenters, etc., spread from its rooms over all Germany. After the time of Rabanus Maurus, the school lost some of its lustre, though it continued to exercise a great and beneficial influence for several centuries. Under Abbot Werner (968-982) the monastery obtained the primacy among the abbeys of Germany, and Odo I. gave the abbey the title and dignity of arch-chancellor of the realm. In the fourteenth century the abbey successfully resisted an attack of the burghers of the city of Fulda, and
in the sixteenth it fortunately escaped the Reformation; but its significance as a social institution is of course lost long ago.


**FULLERTONIUS FERRANDUS,** a friend or relation of Fulgentius of Ruspe, whom he followed into banishment under Thrasimund, king of the Vandals, and with whom he lived at Cagliari, in Sardinia, until 523, when he returned to Carthage, where he became a deacon, and died before 547. He left a *Vita Fulgentii Ruspensis,* a *Breviatio Canonum* (of great interest for the history of canon law), and a number of Letters, of which especially one addressed to the Roman deacon Pelagius, and another to the Roman canon, Anatolius, concerning the Three-Chapter controversy, is of great interest. His works were first edited by P. F. CHIFFLET, Dijon, 1849, afterwards often; as, for instance, in MIGNE: Pal. Lat., vol. 67.

**FULLERTONIUS OF RUSPE,** b. at Telepte, a city of North Africa, 408; d. at Ruspe, in the province of Byzacena, Jan. 1, 533; belonged to a distinguished senatorial family, and was educated for a brilliant political career, but felt himself so strongly drawn towards a life of devotion, seclusion, and asceticism, that he entered a monastery, very much against the wishes of his family. After a journey to Sicily, Italy, and Rome, occupied by the Arian King Thrasimund's persecutions of the Catholics, he was chosen Bishop of Ruspe in 508, but was shortly after banished, together with sixty other Catholic bishops, from North Africa. He settled in Sardinia, and remained there till 523, when the death of Thrasimund allowed him to return. A year before his death he retired from office, and spent his last days in a monastery. As well during his exile, as before and after, he developed a great literary activity; and his writings, among which were first published by W. Pirkheimer (Nurem., 1520), and most completely by Mangeant (Paris, 1864), also in MIGNE: Patrol. Lat., vol. 65. (See Mally's translation of his Life by a pupil, Wien, 1885.)

**FULKE, William, D.D.,** an able Puritan divine; b. in London some time before 1538 (as we learn incidentally from his own statements); d. August, 1588. Educated at Cambridge, he became fellow of St. John's College. He studied law for six years; but, turning his attention to the ministry, he espoused the Puritan cause and became a most zealous champion of Puritanism. A sermon preached in 1565 against popish habits in ecclesiastical establishments evoked the opposition of the university authorities. Removed from his office, he was made, in succession, rector of Wareley and Kedington. After a trip to the Continent, he was chosen (1578) Master of Pembrook Hall and Margaret Professor of Divinity. On a tablet erected to his memory at Kedington are these two lines amongst others:

"His works will show him free from all error,
Rome's foe, Truth's champion, and the Remembrancer's terror."

They indicate the general tenor of Fulke's life. He was a fearless opponent of Romanism, at different times being engaged in public disputations with Papists. In controversy he was one of the ablest divines of his day. His principal works are, *Conflation of a libelle, etc. (1671), The Discovery of the Dangerous Rock of the Popish Church* (1580), *Defence of the sincere and true translation of the Holy Scriptures into Eng. against the Cassius of Gregory Martin* (1588, recently published by the Parker Society, Cambridge, 1849). He was also the author of some works against astrology. See *Brook, Lives of the Puritans,* p. 385 sqq., Lond., 1813, and the Memoir prefixed to the volume of the Parker Society.

**FULLER, Andrew,** a distinguished Baptist divine; was b. at Wicken, Cambridgeshire, Feb. 6, 1754; d. at Kettering, May 7, 1815. He received only a common-school education. Joining the church at sixteen, he exercised his gifts occasionally at religious meetings, and was ordained (1775) pastor of the Baptist Church in Soham. In 1782 he passed to the church at Kettering. He was honored with the degree of D.D. by Princeton and Yale Colleges, but never used the title. Mr. Fuller's reputation rests, not upon his pulpit achievements, but upon his services as a theological writer, and a promoter of Baptist missionary efforts. He stood in intimate relations with Carey, and contributed to awaken in his mind an interest in the heathen. He was one of the founders of the Baptist Missionary Society in a back-parlor at Kettering, Oct. 2, 1792, and was made its first secretary. As a theological writer, one of his biographers (Dr. Ryland) pronounces him "the most judicious and able theological writer that ever belonged to the Baptist denomination." He shared with Robert Hall and John Foster a first place in the esteem of the Baptists of his day. His principal works are the following. *The Gospel Worthy of all Acceptation,* a work which involved him in a protracted controversy of nearly twenty years. In opposition to hyper-Calvinism, he here elaborates the principle that all may apply for the gospel, confidently expecting to receive its benefits. "No man is an unbeliever," he says, "but because he will be so." *The Gospel its own Witness,* an able criticism upon Deism, and reply to such writers as Thomas Paine. *The Calvinistic and Socinian Systems Examined.* pronounced by Robert Hall to be his ablest work. *Expository Notes on Genesis,* 2 vols. *Dialogues and Letters between Criopus and Gaius,* containing discussions of Total Depravity and other theological topics.

**LIT. — Complete Works, Am. ed., 1833, 2 vols., with Memoir by his son, Andrew Gunton Fuller; Lives of Fuller, by his friend John Ryland, D.D. (Lond., 1816), J. W. Morris (Lond., 1836), and Thomas Ekins Fuller, his grandson (Lond., 1863).**

**FULLER, Richard, D.D.,** an eloquent Baptist preacher; b. in Beaufort, S.C., April 22, 1804; d. in Baltimore, Oct. 20, 1878, from a malignant carbuncle. After graduating at Harvard (1824), he practised law in his native town, where he soon
secured a lucrative practice. In the meetings of the great revivalist Rev. Daniel Baker, in 1832, he was converted, and joined the Baptist Church.

"His case was a very clear and delightful one," is an entry in Mr. Baker's journal, referring to him. He was ordained the same year, and began his pastoral career as pastor of the Seventh Baptist Church in Baltimore, and in 1871 removed with a part of the congregation to the fine new edifice on Eutaw Place. Dr. Fuller was a man of fine presence of body, and endowments of mind. He was a born orator, and is said to have carried off, on several occasions, the honors with Webster and Clay on the platform. As a preacher he stood in the front rank of the most eloquent and scriptural of his generation. He was for a time co-editor of the Baltimore Herald, and published Letters on the Roman Chancery (Balt., 1840), Baptism and Communion (Balt., 1841), and a number of sermons in pamphlet form. See Cuthbert: Life of R. Fuller, N.Y., 1879.

FULLER, Thomas, D.D., a learned and witty divine and church-historian; b. 1608, at Aldwinkle, Northamptonshire, where his father was rector; d. Aug. 16, 1661, in London. He was educated at Cambridge, and in 1631 was made fellow of Sidney College, and prebend of Salisbury. This year he issued his first publication, David's Hainous Sinne, Heartie Repentance and Heaevie Punishment. In 1634 he was made rector of Broad Windsor, and, 1641, lecturer of the Savoy in London. The year before, he published at Cambridge The Hist. of the Holy War, an account of the Crusades, and in 1642 The Hist. of the Holy and Prophane States, an interesting collection of essays and biographies. Fuller was a Royalist; and in 1643 he entered the Royal army as chaplain, but kept a prudent silence during the Commonwealth period. During his service in the army, he began the investigations which resulted in a work, published after the author's death (1662), entitled History of the Worthies of England, Endeavoured by Thor Fuller, D.D. The subject matter of this work is treated under the chief cardinal articles of the Christian faith, and includes the most varied information about their products, animals, buildings, battles, proverbs, eminent men, etc. In 1650 appeared his Pisgah sight of Palestine and the Confines thereof, with the history of the Old and New Testament actae thereon. Fuller was presented with the living of Waltham Abbey in 1648, and at the Restoration, in 1660, was re-admitted to his lectureship in the Savoy, and made chaplain in extraordinary to the king.

In 1656 Fuller published his great work, Church Hist. of Britain from the birth of Jesus Christ to the year 1656, to which was subjoined a Hist. of the University of Cambridge, as well as of his works, abounds in quaint humor and epigrammatic sayings. He was an inveterate punster, and delighted in striking alliterations, but was also recognized by his contemporaries as a "perfect walking library." His memory is also recorded as having an incredible facility. He was able to repeat five hundred strange words after hearing them twice, and on one occasion undertook to repeat backwards and forwards in regular order all the shop-signs along the street from Temple Bar to Cheapside, after passing them once, and accomplished it. Coleridge says that "he was incomparably the most sensible, the least prejudiced, great man of an age that boasted a galaxy of great men."

Lit. — Amongst the works by Fuller not already mentioned are his devotional manuals, Good Thoughts in Bad Times (1645), Good Thoughts in Worse Times (1647), Mist Contemplations in Better Times (1660); all bearing upon the vicissitudes of the Royalist cause, but containing thoughts for all times, and which to day are read with delight and profit. Most of Fuller's works have been republished in this century. The best edition of his Church History is that of J. Nichols, 3 vols., Lond., 1688; Of the Worthies of England, by Nuttall, 3 vols., Lond., 1840. See the biographies by Russell (Lond., 1844) and of Bailey (Lond., 1874), the latter an exhaustive work.

FUNCK, Johann, b. at Wohrd, a suburb of Nuremberg, Feb. 7, 1518; d. at Ingolstadt, Oct. 28, 1566; studied theology at Wittenberg, and was appointed preacher in his native town in 1539, but was dismissed by the magistrate of Nuremberg in 1547, on the approach of the emperor. In the same year he entered the service of Duke Albrecht of Prussia; was made court-preacher in 1549; became one of Osiander's most ardent adherents, and after his death the leading representative of his ideas, and exercised, through his intimacy with the duke, a decisive influence on all affairs in Prussia, political as well as ecclesiastical. Though he in 1556 became reconciled with the Wittenberg theologians, and in 1563 actually retracted what he had written in defence of Osiander, he was, nevertheless, in 1566, put under the accusation of heresy, and disturbance of the peace, and condemned. Of his Chronologia ab orhe com[. in pamphlet form. See Curiias: Life of R. Fuller, N.Y., 1879. W. MÖLLER.

FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES OF CHRISTIANITY. The distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines is a useful one, as adapted, by bringing out in sharp outline the great cardinal articles of the Christian faith, to unify the various parts of the Christian Church, and to develop a spirit of tolerance towards each other with regard to the articles of lesser importance in which they disagree.

History. — The Roman-Catholic Church rejects the distinction (Wetzer and Welte, art. Dogma, III. pp. 195 sq.) on the ground that it resolves doctrines into essential or necessary, and unessential or incidental. Although it is not universally made by Protestant theologians, it early came into use. Hunnius, in 1626, was the first to use the distinction in the Lutheran Church in his De fundamentali dispensiis et lege (the fundamental difference in the Lutheran and Calvinistic theologies). He was followed by Quenstedt and others, and recently by Philippi (Glaubenslehre, l. 73 sq.), who, starting from the atonement as the constitutive principle, defines the fundamental all articles which necessarily follow from it.

The distinction was urged by the younger Turretine, and in England by Chillingworth, Stillington, Waterland, and others in the interest of ecclesiastical toleration; Lord Bacon having before, in his
Advancement of Learning, insisted upon distinguishing between points of fundamental and points which he calls "points of further perfection." The Parliament of 1653 voted indulgence to all who professed the "Fundamentals," and appointed a commission, consisting of Archbishop Ussher (who resigned, his place being filled by Baxter), Owen, Goodwin, and others, to define what these were. Baxter was for holding to the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments. But the commission drew up sixteen articles, which were presented to Parliament, and only missed ratification by its sudden dissolution. Neal (Hist. Puritans, II. pp. 148 sqq., Harpers' ed.) gives a full account of this movement. The varying importance of the doctrines of the Christian system and the growing tolerance of this century have produced the conviction that it is desirable to emphasize the more important articles. The Evangelical Alliance, with the object of maintaining Christianity, then, are those which lie at the basis of the Christian system, and without which its professed and comprehensive aim (the glory of God and the highest welfare of man) could not, by logical necessity and with subjective certainty, be evolved.

Waterland's definition is as follows: "Fundamental, as applied to Christianity, means something so necessary to its being, or at least its well-being, that it could not subsist, or maintain itself tolerably, without it" (v. p. 74). And again: "Whatever verities are found to be plainly and directly essential to the doctrine of the Gospel covenant are fundamental" (p. 103).

According to Sherlock (Vindication, etc., p. 256), they are doctrines "which are of the essence of Christianity, and without which the whole building and superstructure must fall."

The most fundamental doctrine of Christianity is salvation by Christ; and the principle will hold good, that whatever doctrine stands in most necessary connection therewith is the most fundamental. The statement in Rom. 1. 1-6 (the divine existence, Scriptures, incarnation, grace, faith, and resurrection) approaches the greatest passage in Scripture to a comprehensive enumeration of the fundamental doctrines. Waterland enumerated seven; as follows: (1) The Creator, or Covenant; (2) The Trinity; (3) The Incarnation; (4) The Great Atonement; (5) Repentance and a holy life; (6) Sacraments; (7) Two future states. The central principle from which he started was the Christian covenant. The sacraments, however, can hardly be regarded as fundamental. We prefer the following statement: (1) The Fatherhood of God; (2) The Trinity; (3) The Incarnation; (4) Atonement; (5) Faith or union with Christ; (6) The immortality of the soul; (7) The Scriptures the summary of the divine purposes concerning man.

In defining what is fundamental in Christianity, it is a task almost impossible to avoid a narrow and a latitudinarian tendency. Certain communions insist upon regarding episcopacy and the authority of the church as fundamental. Individuals might insist upon particular views of original sin, the divine decrees, the inspiration of the fundamental doctrines, and nature and nature of future punishment. But few of these are touched upon in the Apostles' Creed, and none definitely
answered. Divergence of view on these points is of inconsiderable importance in comparison with the cardinal doctrines of God's existence, the Messiah's work, saving faith, the soul's immortality, and the sufficiency of Scripture for human illumination and guidance, and cannot limit the perpetuity of Christianity. It is, however, not to be forgotten that a church may profess these fundamental doctrines, and yet so combine fundamental errors as to modify, if not to completely destroy their force. Of such errors, as held in the Roman Catholic Church, Sherlock says (p. 314) that "all the wit of man cannot reconcile them with the Christian faith." On the other hand, a religious communion (as the strict Unitarians or Universalists) may deny fundamental truths, and yet sincerely accept Christianity as the only and perfect religion, and Christ as the Lord and Saviour.


D. S. Scapp.

FUNERAL. See Burial.

FURSEY (Furse), b. of noble parents in Ireland, d. at Maceray or Mazerelles (modern Mezières, in Ardenne), 120 miles n. of Paris, about 650. He was educated in the monastery of Inchinquich, an island in Lough Corrib, 3 miles north of Galway. He gathered a school at Rathmat (now, probably, Killurhas), and there built a church. At some later period he removed to Munster to labor among his relatives, and while with them, in 627, he had his first visions, which occurred, however, when he was very seriously ill. The publication of these visions was a very important and effectual developing and fixing the eschatological ideas of the Middle Age. Indeed, his visions lay at the basis of Dante's Divina Commedia. When he removed to England is uncertain, but on coming to East Anglia he was kindly received by King Sigeoald, mayor under Clovis. The fame of Lagny reached Ireland and attracted monks from thence. Shortly before he died Fursey had a great desire to revisit some of the churches he had founded in the different countries of his residence and labor. Accordingly he started and went in a northeast-erly direction. At the modern Mezières he was taken ill and died. His body was brought to Perowne, about 65 miles to the west by north, and there buried. His tomb became a favorite place of pilgrimage from all parts of Gaul and Britain. Many miracles were said to have been wrought there.


FÜRST, Julius, Hebrew lexicographer; b. at Zerkowo, Posen, May 12, 1805; d. in Leipzig, Feb. 9, 1875. He studied at Berlin, Posen, and Breslau, and in 1846 became professor at Leipzig. He was of Jewish descent, and won fame by his oriental researches. One of his theories was that tri- lateral should be reduced to bilateral roots. This idea is now generally discarded. In consequence of this and other philological notions, his great Hebrisches u. Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch (Leip- zig, 1857-61, 2 vols., 2d ed., 1868, 8d ed. by Vic- tor Ryssel, 1876, Eng. trans. by Samuel Davidson, Leipzig, 1865, 1886, 4th ed., 1871) is not generally considered as equal to Gesenius's. Probably his best work was upon his Concordants Libr. Sacr. V. T. Heb. et Chal. (Leipzig, 1837-40), in which he was aided by Franz Delitzsch, as he handsomely acknowledges. See Concordance. Among his other works (all published in Leipzig) are : Bibliotheca Judaica, 1849-63, 3 vols.; Gesch. d. Kardertumeth (said to be very inaccurate), 1862- 65, 3 vols.; Gesch. d. b. Lit. u. d. juid.-hess. Schriftthumeth, 1867-70, 2 vols.; and Canon d. A. T. nach d. Ueberl. in Talmud u. Midrash, 1868. Fürst's books evince great learning, but must be used with caution, for they are not reliable.

FUTURE PUNISHMENT. Belief in the punishment after death of sin committed in this life is well-nigh universal. It accords with instinctive justice, and is one of the bases of the doctrine of a future existence. But as to the nature and duration of that punishment there is great diver- gency. The Old Testament gives little information in its eschatological portions, although there was a belief in a future state and in some sort of punish- ment for the wicked. The New Testament is largely taken up with the affairs of the kingdom, and pays only passing attention to those who live outside of it, but the overwhelming majority of Christians have always believed, and their creeds have well-nigh unanimously maintained, that the New Testament plainly teaches that the punish- ment of those outside the kingdom is endless and conscious. This opinion was held by the early Fathers, who had, however, gross views on this subject. Conceiving that the life of the wicked after death was necessarily carried on in a place, they set forth that place as full of the cries of woe. Fire was commonly represented as the instrument of punishment. But to Origen (155-
254) the punishment was remedial or disciplinary, and when its end was accomplished the soul was freed from it. He, moreover, considered this punishment as mental, such as the sense of separation from God, remorse of conscience over committed sin, and the general loss of all peace of mind (De Principiis, ii. 10). When we come down to a later period we find increasing grossness in the conception of the pains of the damned, although Lactantius (4th cent.) and Gregory Nazianzen (330—390) are exceptions; and increasing outspokenness or conviction of their eternity. Arnobius (Adv. Gentes, ii., 36, 61) maintained that these pains would cease because the sufferer would be ultimately annihilated. Origenian restorationism was generally condemned. The great Augustine (353—430) taught that there were degrees in the punishment; the mildest degree he assigned to those who had died in infancy unbaptized. The Schoolmen mapped out the unseen universe, and made hell to consist of different departments. Its punishments were frightful, an endless repetition of the cruelties of the Inquisition. Dante borrowed his descriptions of them in large part from Thomas Aquinas. The modern Roman Catholic Church and the orthodox Protestant churches agree in maintaining the essential points of the historic creed upon this tenet—viz., the eternity and the severity of future punishment. In opposition to this view there are three. First, the absolute denial of all future punishment. This was preached by the elder Ballou (1771—1852) as true Universalism; but it has few advocates to-day. Second, punishment is disciplinary and remedial, and therefore that when the divine purpose is accomplished, the sinner, purified by suffering, is restored to the divine favor. This is the doctrine of Restorationism or the Apokalastasis (q.v.). Third, eternal life is the gift of God; it is not given to those who die in wilful rebellion against God; such never live in any true sense, but are punished while they exist, and finally become extinct. This is the theory of Annihilationism or Conditional Immortality. See Punishment for literature and further discussion.

FUTURE STATE. See Eschatology.
GAB'ATHA (John xix. 13), an Aramaic word signifying "a hill, or elevated spot of ground." The Greek name, λυμωρεςιον, means "pavement;" and, as the two words occur together, we are probably to understand that Pilate's tribunal was erected in the open air, upon a rising ground, the top of which was laid with tessellated pavement. Ewald proposed to give to yap the same meaning as the Greek λυμωρεςιον, by deriving it from a root, yap, with the meaning of yap (Aramaic, to insert). But, as Weiss in Meyer in loco says, "This is too precocious a derivation."

GABLER, Johann Philipp, one of the prominent rationalists of his day; b. at Francfort, June 4, 1758; d. at Jena, Feb. 17, 1826; professor of theology at Altorf 1785, and at Jena 1804. His principal work is his edition of Eichhorn's Urgeschichte, to which he wrote an introduction and notes, Altorf, 1790-93. 2 vols. As editor of various theological periodicals, he wrote a great number of minor essays, of which a selection was made by his sons, Ulm, 1831, in 2 vols. A memoir was written by W. Schrütter, Jena, 1827. He was a man of ceaseless activity, stained with various theological periodicals, he wrote a great number of minor essays, of which a selection was made by his sons, Ulm, 1831, in 2 vols. A memoir was written by W. Schrütter, Jena, 1827. He was a man of ceaseless activity, stained with various theological periodicals, he wrote a great number of minor essays, of which a selection was made by his sons, Ulm, 1831, in 2 vols. A memoir was written by W. Schrütter, Jena, 1827. He was a man of ceaseless activity, stained with various theological periodicals, he wrote a great number of minor essays, of which a selection was made by his sons, Ulm, 1831, in 2 vols. A memoir was written by W. Schrütter, Jena, 1827.

GABRIEL (man of God), the angel who explained to Daniel the vision of the ram and the he-goat, predicted concerning the Seventy Weeks (Dan. viii. 19, ix. 21), announced the births of John and Jesus (Luke i. 19, 26), and was, according to Enoch (chap. ix.), one of the four great archangels (Gabriel, Michael, Uriel, and Raphael). He figures prominently in post-biblical Jewish literature. Pseudo-Jonathan declares that he was the man who directed Joseph to his brethren (Gen. xxxvii. 15), and also, with Michael, Uriel, Jophiel, Jephthahiah, and the Metatron, buried Moses. The Targum on 2 Chron. xxii. 21 names him as the angel who smote the host of Sennacherib. In the Koran he becomes the medium of divine revelation; and so Mohammedians call him the "Holy Spirit," and "Spirit of Truth." He is upon the calendar of the Greek, Coptic, and Armenian churches.

GABRIL SIONITA, b. at Edden, a village on Mount Lebanon, 1577; d. in Paris, 1648; was educated in the Maronite college in Rome, and appointed professor of oriental language at College de France in 1616; furnished the Syriac and Arabic versions to LeJay's polyglot Bible, and wrote several works in Arabic, Latin, and Italian, as, for instance, Dottrina christiana ad uso de' jaili oriental (1698), and an Arabic grammar.

GAD, the name of a divinity only once mentioned in the Old Testament, in Isa. lxv. 11 (in the A. V., Gad is translated "troop"); but it was evidently adapted in Canaan, as the name Baal-Gad (e.g., Josh. xi. 17) testifies, as do also allusions in the Mishnah, in Jacob of Sarug, and Isaac Antiochenus. The Hebrew word gad meant "luck," and, as it was connected with the divinity, the latter must have been considered a friend to man, and therefore prayed to for luck. Perhaps a trace of its general use, in the sense of "luck," is in the exclamation of Leah (Gen. xxxv. 11) and in the name Gaddiel (Num. xiii. 10). Some would, upon insufficient grounds, identify Gad with the planet Jupiter; cf. Baudissin, Jahre et Moloch, 1874, pp. 38 sq. More probably Gad was related to the Syro-Phoenician divinity, At. See P. Scholz: Götzdienst u. Zaubercerzen bei den alten Hebrnern, Regensburg, 1877, pp. 409-411, and the art. Gad, in Winer's, in Schenkel's, and in Riehm's Bible Dictionaries.

GAD. See Tribes of Israel.

GAD'ARA, the fortified capital of Perea, stood on a hill south of the river Hieromax, or Yarmuk, the present Shi'ar el-Mandilhur, and southwest of the southern end of the Sea of Galilee, sixty stadia from Tiberias. The great roads from Tiberias and Scythopolis, to the interior of Petraea and to Damascus, passed through it. After a siege of ten months, it was taken by Alexander Janneaus, but was restored by Pompey (Josephus, Antiqu., XIV. 4. 4). The city was made by his sons, Ulm, 1831, in 2 vols. A memoir was written by W. Schrütter, Jena, 1827. He was a man of ceaseless activity, stained with various theological periodicals, he wrote a great number of minor essays, of which a selection was made by his sons, Ulm, 1831, in 2 vols. A memoir was written by W. Schrütter, Jena, 1827.

GADARAS, or Tiberias sagittata, was an important town in antiquity near the Sea of Galilee, with an estimated population of 30,000 by AD 115, and in the Roman era, it had 24 temples, two amphitheatres, and an aqueduct. It was the site of a battle between the Romans and theives, and a town of great commercial importance. It became the seat of one of the five sanhedrins established by Gabinius, and was by Augustus presented to Ilerod, after whose death it was incorporated with the Province of Syria, though without losing entirely its autonomy. It formed part of the so-called Decapolis (Matt. iv. 25; Mark v. 20, vii. 31); and March 4, 68, it was captured by Vespasian (Josephus, Bell. Jud., IV, 7, 3). Most of its inhabitants were heathens; and the gods principally worshipped were Zeus, Hercules, Astarte, and Athene. Afterwards it became the seat of a Christian bishopric. The date and cause of its destruction are unknown. Its site was identified with the present village Umm Keis, by Seetzen and Burckhardt. The hot sulphur-springs in the neighborhood, famous in antiquity under the name of Amathus (Eusebius, Onomasticon, Aigadi), are still used. It may have been the scene of the miracle of our Lord healing the demoniac (Matt. viii. 26; Mark v. 1; Luke viii. 26); though the text is somewhat doubtful, varying between ωρα των Γασσιὼν and Γασσιεων and Ῥηξεων As each of these readings has some weighty evidence in its favor, and a mistake either one the way or the other is easily explained, a final decision can hardly yet be pronounced. [Dr. William M. Thomson has clearly identified the biblical Gergesa with Chersa, or Khera, on the eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee, opposite Medjel, on the slope of a hill in Wady Samakh, within forty feet of the water's edge. The narrative of the evangelists corresponds precisely with the nature of the locality, while Gadara is too far distant from the sea. See W. M. Thomson: The Land and the Book, II, pp. 84-85; and Schiaparelli, Through Bible Lands, p. 349.]
GALATIA, a Roman province occupying the central portion of Asia Minor, and bounded north by Bithynia and Paphlagonia, east by Pontus, south by Cappadocia and Lycaonia, and west by Phrygia. It was inhabited by Celtic tribes, which in 279 B.C. were brought as mercenaries from Macedonia into Asia Minor by Nicomedes, king of Bithynia. Afterwards they made war on their own account, and devastated the country in all directions. The pushing northwards of the Romans had at that time put the Celtic masses in motion; and new swarms continued to pour into Asia Minor, until in 233 B.C. they were utterly defeated by Attalus, King of Pergamus, and compelled to settle down in peace in the region which then received its name from them.—Galatia, Gaul. There they lived in three distinct tribes,—the Trocmi with the capital Tavium, the Tectassae with the capital Ancyra, and the Tolstoioboci with the capital Pessinus, but united first under a kind of republican constitution, afterwards under a king. Augustus made the country a Roman province (25 B.C.); and its boundaries were afterwards several times changed. But in Galatia proper the inhabitants retained the stamp of their Celtic origin, both in language and customs, down to the time of Jerome. Paul visited the country twice,—on his second and on his third missionary tour (Acts xvi. 6, xvii. 23); and to the congregations founded there he addressed one of his most important epistles. See Introduction to the Commentaries on Galatians, by Meyer (6th ed. by Sieffert, 1880), Wieseler, Lightfoot, Schaff, especially Lightfoot.

GALATIANS, Epistle to the. See PAUL.

GALBANUM, one of the ingredients of the sacred perfume prescribed in Exod. xxx. 34. It is the resin of a plant growing in Abyssinia, Arabia, and Syria, obtained by an incision. It is fat, sticky, of bitter strong smell and taste: at first white, it becomes yellow with white spots. When burnt, it gives out a disagreeable smoke, by which snakes and vermin are driven away. It is uncertain from what plant it is produced. The use of the sacred perfume prescribed in Exod. xxx. 34. It was one of the ingredients of the consecrated incense of the temple of Jerusalem, and the use of it was enjoined as a necessary part of all prevailing prayer. W. PRESSEL.

GALE, Theophilus, a learned nonconformist divine; b. at Scruton, Yorkshire, Jan. 20, 1648; d. there Jan. 12, 1779; was abbot of the congregation of St. Gall, an Irish monk, and pupil of St. Columban, on the Steinhach, in Switzerland. He built his cell in the thick forest there about 613, and gathered a number of hermits, who lived together according to the rule of St. Columban; he died Oct. 16, 627, the date varies between 625 and 650. Under Otmar, who is considered the first abbot of St. Gall (720-759), the institution began to grow very rapidly. He substituted the rule of St. Benedict for that of St. Columban, erected a church in honor of St. Gall, founded a hospital for lepers, and organized the school, afterwards so famous; as early as 771 a monk of the monastery wrote a life of its patron. Under Gozbert (816-837) the monastery was exempted from the authority of the Bishop of Constance, and made a free, royal abbey, with right to elect its own abbot. He rebuilt the church, and parts of the monastery, in a magnificent style. Under Salomon III. (899-919) the prosperity of the institution reached its height. Under Notker Laebe and the Ekhards the school became one of the great centres of learning and culture. The monks of St. Gall were especially famous as transcribers. The library was one of the greatest in the world. Many classical works have been preserved only through copies made by the monks of St. Gall; and in artistic respects their works were often masterpieces. They also excelled as musicians, probably started in both these directions by the Irish founders of the abbey. In 1413 the city of St. Gall, having acquired great industrial and commercial importance, revolted against the abbot, and obtained its freedom. The Reformation the abbey withstood without any great loss, but after that period its occupation was gone. In possession of enormous revenues, it lived on, quietly decaying, until the time of the Revolution, when in 1798 it was secularized: its estates were confiscated, and its terrors numbered into a bishopric. Sources to the history of St. Gall are found in the two first volumes of Monumenta Germaniae, and in Wattenbach, Deutsch. Geschichts-Quellen, I. See ILDEFONS von ARX: Geschichte d. Kantons St. Gallen, 1830-1833, 3 vols.; FRANZ WEIDMANN: Geschichte der Stiftsbibliothek St. Gal- len, 1841.

MEYER VON KNONAU.

GALLANO, Andrea, b. at Venice, Dec. 6, 1709; d. there Jan. 12, 1779; was abbot of the congregation of the Oratorians, and published Biblio- theca veterum Patrum, antiquorum saeculorum; and in 1766-81, 14 vols. fol., containing the works of three hundred and eighty authors.

GALLANDI, Andrea, b. at Venice, Dec. 6, 1709; d. there Jan. 12, 1779; was abbot of the congregation of the Oratorians, and published Bibliotheca veterum Patrum, antiquorum saeculorum; and in 1766-81, 14 vols. fol., containing the works of three hundred and eighty authors.
GALLAUDET. Thomas Hopkins, LL.D., the beginner of deaf-mute instruction in America; b. at Philadelphia, Dec. 10, 1787; d. at Hartford, Sept. 9, 1851. He was graduated at Yale College 1803, and at Andover 1811; became interested in deaf-mute instruction; superintended the organization of an institution at Hartford for the purpose, having sailed for France in 1816 to study existing methods. He began his instructions, with Laurent le Clerc (a deaf-mute taught by Abbé Sicard) as his assistant, April 15, 1817, with seven pupils, and labored assiduously on new lines, and successfully, receiving many honors, until 1830, when ill health compelled his retirement from the headship, although he continued to be one of the directors. He had the satisfaction of seeing similar institutions in different parts of the country, and the instruction greatly improved, owing to his investigations and those incited by him. From 1830 to his death he was chaplain of the Connecticut Retreat for the Insane at Hartford. Among his publications were six volumes of Annals of the Deaf and Dumb, Hartford. See his Biography by Heman Humphrey, N.Y., 1851. — Two of his sons, Thomas and Edward Miner, have also won an international reputation by their labors for deaf-mutes.

GALLICAN CONFESSION, The (Confessio Gallicana, La confession de foi des églises réformées de France, also called La confession de la Rochelle), was adopted by the first national synod of the Reformed Church of France, convened in Paris 1559, under the moderatorship of Chandieu, and is based on a draft sent by Calvin to François de Morel. It was printed in Geneva, Chandieu, and is based on a draft sent by Calvin to François de Morel. It was printed in Geneva, and generally attached to the French Bible. In 1561, during the Conference of Poissy, it was officially presented to the king, Charles IX., by delegates from all the Reformed congregations in France. By the seventh national synod, convened at La Rochelle 1571, under the moderatorship of Beza, and at which were present Jeanne d’Albret, queen of Navarre, her son Henry of Béarn, the Prince of Condé, Admiral de Coligny, and others, it received its final ratification. Three copies of it were inscribed on parchment, and subscribed by one for Geneva, one for Béarn, and one for La Rochelle. It was the symbolic book of the French Reformed Church; and, up to the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, every minister before entering his office, and every new member before entering the congregation, had to subscribe to it. The National Synod of 1872 did not restore its authority, but gave its general assent to it in a brief summary of the faith as now held by the Reformed Church of France. See Schaff: Creeds of Christendom, vol. i. pp. 480 sqq.

GALLICANISM denotes that spirit of nationality, which, within the Church of France, developed a peculiar set of customs, privileges, maxims, and views, especially with respect to her relations to Rome. Not that there is any thing like a tendency towards brecy or schism in this spirit, not even towards independence in the sense of separation; but there is a consciousness of the freedom of a church, a consciousness of individual development from an individual historical basis, which causes resistance to any attempt by Rome at absorption or amalgamation. Started by Irenaeus, there arose in Gaul, towards the close of the third century, a church community independent of Rome, but by no means indifferent to her authority, free, and yet in the most intimate connection with Rome. A number of great men distinguished for piety carried this development farther, in spite of the turbulence and barbarism of the time; and the movement with their flourishing schools aided the movement, until finally the Gallo-Frankian Church was moulded into perfect shape by the powerful hands of Charlemagne; and from that moment the independence of the French Church, meaning simply her national individuality, has been vindicated with energy and decision whenever an able king or parliament or bishop appeared upon the stage.

Very characteristic in this respect are the three decrees of Louis IX. (1226—70), issued 1229, 1239, and 1270. The first gives in its introductory part a general survey of the La definition of the Church of France; the second limits the bishop's power of excommunication, and places the clergy under the jurisdiction of the State in all civil affairs; the third, the pragmatic sanction, guarantees the independence of the episcopal authority against the encroachments of the Pope, secures the privilege of electing the bishop to the chapters and the diocesan clergy, and vindicates the right of the French Church to convene a French council. Still more precisely defined became the position of the Gallican Church by the controversy between Boniface VIII. and Philippe IV., the Fair, 1289-1314. The questions at issue were of the greatest importance,—to the nation, as Boniface VIII., in a public speech, declared France to be a dependency of the German Empire; to the state, as immense sums of money yearly crossed the Alps under the form of annats; to the king, as the Pope denied his right to tax the clergy for certain purposes of urgent necessity; and to the church in general, as the Pope attempted to introduce essential changes into the relation between the bishops and the curia. The moment for this controversy was very untimely chosen by the Pope. The king was most cordially supported, not only by his Parliament, but also by the clergy and the mass of the people, and he came out of the contest victorious. But though both the kings and the parliaments, the bishops and the universities, unanimously asserted that they would cling forever to the decrees of the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basel (which, indeed, were the dictates of Gallicanism), the Roman curia never let pass by unused an opportunity to preach the opposite doctrines. Strife occurred every now and then, though always with the same issue,—defeat to Rome. When in 1455 the Bishop of Nantes ventured an appeal from a royal decree to the Roman curia, the Parliament of France stepped in, and accused and condemned him for offence against the constitutional laws and ecclesiastical privileges of France.

There is, however, a famous exception to this rule; namely, the abolition, in 1516, of the pragmatic sanction of Bourges, the last synod, in consequence of the concordat concluded between Leo X. and Francis I., 1515-47. The reasons of this concordat are well known. The king expected to be invested with the fief of
Naples; and his chancellor, Duprat, expected to be adorned with a cardinal's hat. But, however great this change was theoretically considered, practically it did not amount to much. The decrees of the above-mentioned three councils continued to regulate the feeling of the nation, the teaching of the university, the proceedings of the clergy, the measures of parliament; and, while the decrees of the Council of Trent (1545-63) were promulgated (which, if accepted in toto, would, indeed, have annihilated Gallicanism), only such of them were accepted in France as hesitated with respect to the true relation between the papal see and the national church. Pierre Pithou caused it to disappear. Not to speak of his Corpus juris canonici, Code canonum, and Gallican Ecclesiastica, in his Libretes de l'Eglise gallicane (1594) he gave in eighty-three articles a representation of the whole case, so clear and precise, that everybody could comprehend it.

From another point of view, but with equal clearness and pithiness, Bossuet gave a representation of the principles of Gallicanism in the Déclaration du Clergé, issued in the name of the Assemblée du Clergé, 1682. It declares that St. Peter, his successors, and the whole Church, have power only in spiritual things; that, however great may be the power of the apostolic see in spiritual things, it cannot overthrow the decrees of the Council of Constance, which it has itself confirmed; that consequently the laws and rules and customs of the Gallican Church, recognized by that council, must remain intact; and, finally, that the decisions of the Pope are not unchangeable, unless the whole Church agrees with him. Alexander VIII. declared this declaration null and void, and addressed a long memoir to the French clergy; and at one moment, in 1691, when no less than thirty-five episcopal sees were vacant in France, because the Pope refused to confirm Abbé de Saint-Aignan as Bishop of Beauvais, showed his true meaning; and in 1718 the Conseil de Régence simply declared that the papal confirmation of a French bishop was unnecessary.

To a great extent, however, Gallicanism lost its hold on the sympathy of the people by the events which took place between 1790 and 1800: they were considered, not as a victory of the Gallican Church over Rome, but as a victory of the Revolution over Christianity. The concordats of 1801 and 1813 very little regard was paid to the principles of Gallicanism. The former made the Church entirely dependent upon the State; the latter made concessions only to the Pope. The current of political re-action which set in with the Restoration was accompanied by a similar current of religious re-action led by Joseph de Maistre, Louis de Bonald, François de Lamennais, etc. The connection between Rome and the French clergy became more and more intimate: the Jesuits returned; the Gallican Liturgy gave place to the Roman; the textbooks of the seminaries were changed; and, shortly after the middle of the present century, Ultramontanism had completely superseded Gallicanism.


GALLIENUS, Publius Licinius (Roman emperor 260-268), b. 218 or 219; associated with his father, 253; acknowledged by the senate, 254; abolished, immediately after his accession, the decrees of his father Valerian, against the Christians, and made Christianity, if not a religion licita, at least tolerated. For this reason he appears in Eusebius' Hist. Eccl. (VII. 23), in the words of Dionysius of Alexandria, as the "restorer of the empire;" and the prophecy of Isa. xliii. 19 is applied to him, the "manifestation of a favorable Old-Testament prophecy being applied to an emperor; while the profane historians describe him as a supercilious and frivolous trifier. The edict itself is not extant, and the causes of it are unknown.

GALL'IOC, a brother of Seneca the philosopher, was prosconul of Achaea when Paul first visited Corinth (Acts xviii. 12). His true name was Marcus Annius Novatus: the name of Gallio he assumed after being adopted by the rhetorician, Junius Galillo. The date and manner of his death are uncertain: it is probable, though, that, like his brother, he was put to death by Nero.

GALLITZIN, Demetrius Augustine, b. at the Hague, where his father was minister plenipotentiary, Dec. 22, 1770; d. at Loretto, Cambria County, Penn., May 6, 1841. He was the son of a Russian prince, and was sent to America by Catharine II., in 1792, as an officer of the imperial Russian guard, not only to study American institutions, but also to overcome a natural timidity of disposition. But, instead of pursuing his profession, he gave himself to the Roman-Catholic priesthood, and March 18, 1795, was ordained in Baltimore. In 1799 he was sent, at his own request, to Cambria County, Pennsylvania, and began the great work of building up Roman-Catholic settlements upon land in that county given and purchased. He won fame by charity and zeal, as " Father Smith," by which name he was naturalized (1805). In 1809 he was allowed by a special act of the Legislature to take his family name. His difficulties and pecuniary embarrassments, arising from his failure to pay for the extensive tract he had bought in the expectation of receiving his Russian fortune, were numerous; but, by unwearied diligence and unspiring self-denial, they were largely overcome. He wrote several good books, particularly Defence of Catholic Principles (Pittsburg, 1816), and Letters to a Protestant Friend on the Scriptures (Pittsburg, 1818). See his Life, by Thomas Heyden (Baltimore, 1869), and by Sarah M. Brown (Baltimore, 1873).

GALLUS, C. Vibius Treronianus (Roman emperor 231-254), put an end to the persecutions of the Christians which Decius had instituted, but was afterwards led, probably by a horrible plague which terrified the people in Italy and Northern
Africain, to adopt harsh measures. Cyprian, in a letter of 253 (Ep. 59), speaks of an edict which ordered all to sacrifice to the pagan gods. Cornelius, the Bishop of Rome, was banished, and so was the successor, Cyprian, in a letter to the Bishop of Rome, was banished, and so was his successor, Lucius.

So he was banished, and so was his successor. Christian tradition represents that he was the Bishop of Rome, invariably called "the Elder" in distinction from his grandson, Gamaliel of Jabneh. He was the grandson of Hillel. The Talmudists are loud in his praise, and said that, "since Gamaliel the Elder is dead, there is no glory of the law left." They state that he was president of the Sanhedrin during the reigns of Tiberius, Caligula, and Claudius; but this is doubtful. He appears only as a simple member of that body in the Acts. In the New Testament, Gamaliel is known as Paul's preceptor (Acts xxii. 3), and tolerant above his contemporaries in his attitude towards the Christian religion (Acts v. 34, 39). He wisely counselled moderation on the ground, that, if the new doctrine were of God, man could not overthrow it, or, if it were of man, it would perish of itself. Christian tradition represents that he was the cousin of Nicodemus. On his conversion to Christianity, was baptized by Peter and John (Clem., Recogn., I. 65; Photius, Cod., 171). This must be regarded as apocryphal, being entirely out of accord with the Talmud. See Grauinus: Hist. Gamalielea, Vit., 1857; Palmer: Paulus u. Gamaliel, Giessen, 1896; Schürer: N. T. Zeitgesch., p. 458 sq.; Smith's Bible Dict.

QAMALIEL OF JABNEH, or the Younger; d. about 115; was famous as a legislator, and head of the supreme judicial Jewish body which met at Jabneh. He visited Rome in 95; and the Talmud abounds in incidents of the journey. See Derenbourg: Hist. de Palestine, chap. xx.

GAMES AMONG THE HEBREWS. The games enjoyed by the Hebrew youth were music, song, and dancing (cf. Ps. xxx. 11; Jer. xxxi. 13). Another amusement seems to have been the lifting of heavy stones (Zech. xii. 3), and target-shooting (I Sam. xx. 20). After the exile, Greek games were introduced in Jerusalem and in other cities of Palestine. Thus Herod created a theatre and amphitheatre at Jerusalem (Joseph., Ant., XV. 8, 1), as well as at Cesarea (Ibid., XV. 9, 6; War, I. 21, 8); and even contests with wild beasts were celebrated. No wonder that the general body of the Jews hated him. In the Talmudic period other games were known; but in general gaming was interdicted, and a gambler's testimony was not admitted.

QANORA, the metropolis of Paphlagonia, was the seat of a council which assembled there, at an uncertain date in the middle of the fourth century, against the Eustathians. This sect had pushed their asceticism to an extreme, rejecting marriage, not only for priests, but also for laymen, demanding complete abstinence from flesh, etc. They were condemned by Council; but as the council recommended marriage not in general, but also for priests, it has caused great embarrassment to the Roman-Catholic Church in her propaganda for sacerdotal celibacy.

CARASSE, François, b. at Angoulême, 1585; d. Poitiers, June 14, 1661; was received in the order of the Jesuits in 1601, and made quite a sensation as a preacher by his smart allusions and the peculiar vivacity of his manner. To posterity, however, he is principally known as a polemical writer. He wrote, against the freethinkers of the age, La doctrine curieuse des beaux arts, 1623; against the Protestants, Elixir Calvinicum, 1615, and Rabelais réformé, 1623. But he lacks knowledge and dignity, often even truthfulness and simple decency. The Roman Catholics themselves were scandalized at his diatribes. See Sudhoff.

GARDINER, James, Col., was b. in Scotland, Jan. 10, 1688, and killed at the battle of Prestonpans, Sept. 21, 1745. The interest of his life centres in his remarkable conversion. He led a career of licentiousness until July, 1719. At a midnight hour, just before the time he had appointed for an assignation with a married woman, as he was listlessly looking through a book called The Christian Soldier, "an unusual blaze of light" suddenly illuminated its pages. Looking up, he saw a "visible representation of the Christ upon the cross, and heard a voice," etc. The consequence was that he forsook his old courses, and afterwards led an exemplary Christian life. Each day being inaugurated with two hours spent in devotion. These facts are narrated in Donbridge's Life of Col. Gardiner. The edition of the Presbyterian Board of Publication, Philadelphia, is convenient in size.

GARDINER, Stephen, Bishop of Winchester, a conspicuous actor in the opposition to the English Reformation; was b. at Bury St. Edmund's, 1483; d. Nov. 12, 1555. He was the illegitimate son of Dr. Woodville, Bishop of Salisbury, and brother of Elizabeth Woodville, Edward IV.'s queen. He was educated at Cambridge, and attained great proficiency in the departments of canonical and civil law. After acting as Wolsey's private secretary, he came into the service of the king. He took a prominent part in the negotiations for the divorce with Catherine, and was sent on missions to Pope Clement VII. In 1531 his services were rewarded with the bishopric of Winchester. He defended the supremacy of the king in an able tract, De Vera Obedientia. But he was not in sympathy with the reforming tendencies, and, but for the royal intervention, would have fastened charges of heresy on Cranmer. Under Edward VI. he was committed to prison for his opposition to the Reformation, where he remained, with the exception of a brief interval, for five years. The favor of Mary released him from prison, restored him to his bishopric, and made him lord-chancellor. He negotiated the marriage treaty with Philip, for which he had, however, a personal repugnance. He was at first in sympathy with the persecution of the Protestants, but afterwards seems to have revolted from it, and retired, leaving the work to the more callous Bonner. Gardiner was an able man, as his influence in two administrations attests. He was probably neither so unscrupulous nor vindictive as some historians have contended.

GARISSOLES, Antoine, b. at Montauban, 1587; d. there 1651; was first pastor of Puylaurens, and then, after 1628, professor of theology in the academy of his native city. He presided at the national synod of Charenton (1645), and published in 1648 Decreti Synodici Carentonensis, est-
ting forth with impartiality and moderation the reasons why the synod condemned the book by Placent. Among his other works are some ser-
mons (Le Voyage de Salut, 1637), and some Latin poems in honor of Gustavus Adolphus and Queen
Christina.

GARNET, Henry Highland, D.D., a prominent
colored clergyman; b. in New Market, Kent
County, Md., April 15, 1815; d. at Monroe,
Liberia, Feb. 12, 1871; appointed and confirmed, he finally sailed Nov. 12, and arrived at his field of labor ec. 28.

GARNET, Jean, b. in Paris, 1612; d. at B0

GARNIER, Karl Bernhard, b. in the neighbor-
hood of Hanover, Jan. 4, 1763; d. at Herubert,
June 22, 1841; was educated by the Moravian
Brethren, and was successively preacher to the con-
gregations of Brethren at Zeyst, Amsterdam,
Ebersdorf, Norden, Berlin (where he rendered
great services during the period between 1810
and 1816), and Naumberg; in 1819 he retired in 1836 on account of old age. He published Christliche Gesänge, Görlitz, 1825, con-
taining 303 hymns, and Brudergesänge, Gnadau,
1827, containing 65 hymns, most of which are
original, and occupying a prominent place in the
hymnology of the present century on account of their clearness and tenderness. K. SUDHOFF.

GASPARD, Agnès, Comte de, a distinguished
layman of the French-Protestant Church; b. in
Orange, France, July 12, 1810; d. at Geneva,
May 8, 1871. In the early part of his life he took
an active interest in French politics, and in
1842 represented Bastia in the House of Depu-
ties. Religious subjects, however, engaged
a large share of his attention. He published 2 vols. on Christianisme and Paganisme; and in
1848, at the synod of the Reformed Churches,
he joined Frédéric Monod in advocating the nec-
ecessity of a well-defined creed. The last twenty-
three years of his life were spent in Switzerland,
at Geneva. His eloquence did good service
in the cause of evangelical religion and morality.
He delivered lectures on many different subjects in the hall of the "Reformation," many of which were published. He was a pronounced enemy of
slavery, and wrote, in advocacy of the Northern
cause, two pamphlets, Un Petit petit, qui veult, 1861, and l'Amerique devant l'Europe, 1862 (Eng.
trans., America before Europe, 3d ed., New York,
1882). A paper prepared by him on The Care of
the Sick, for the Evangelical Alliance Conference,
New York, 1873, was forwarded by his widow,
and is published in its proceedings. He wrote
also Schools of Doubt and Schools of Faith, Edin-
burgh, 1854. Madame Gasparin, his wife, was
also a graceful author. Her Near and Heavenly
Horizons (New York, 1864), and Human Sadness
(Boston, 1864), have been translated. See A.
NAVILLO: Le Comte Ag. de Gasparin, Geneve,
1871; and BOREL: Le Comte Ag. de G., Paris,
1879 (Eng. trans., New York [1880]).

GATAKER, Thomas, a scholarly divine, and
member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines,
was the son of the chaplain to Robert, Earl of
Lester; b. in London, Sept. 4, 1754; d. at Rotherhithe, July 27, 1814. In 1596 he went to
St. John's College, Cambridge, and in 1599 was
chosen fellow of the newly founded Sidney Col-
lege. In 1601 he became preacher at Lincoln's-
inn, and in 1611 removed to the living of Rother-
hithe, Surrey. He outfived four wives. In 1643
he was made a dean by Charles I. He was a
member of the Assembly of Divines. He was offered
and refused the mastership of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Gataker was a man of much learning,
and the author of a number of works. His first
book, Of the Nature and Use of Lots (London,
1619, pp. 360), grew out of sermons preached at
Lincoln's-inn, and was designed to vindicate the
lawfulness of "luscious lots" (games of chance),
and to condemn "divinatory or consultory lots."
This work led to a controversy, and drew forth
from him two more books on the same subject in
1623 (pp. 275) and 1638 (In Latin, A Discussion of the Papish Doctrine of Transsubstan-
tiation, and A Short Catechism, appeared in 1624. Two
volumes of Sermons, 1637 sq.; and in 1645 (3d ed., 1657) he published English Annotations upon
Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Lamentations (a part of the
Assembly's Annotations). He also sent forth valuable critical works, among which was the
edition of Marcus Antoninus, which Itallian says
"was the earliest edition of any classical writer
published in England with original annotations."

These last were edited by the learned Witsrous

GAUDEN, John, b. at Mayfield, in Essex, 1605; d. at Worcester, Sept. 26, 1662; educated at Cambridge, was of the Temple 1626; bishop of Exeter 1660, and of Worcester 1662. He claimed to have written the Eikon Basilike (Eikon Basilikh, — The Pourtraiture of his Sacred Majesty in his Solitudes and Sufferings); but careful and protracted examination has decided against him, and in favor of Charles I., who was the king meant. The book itself appeared in 1648; was replied to by Milton (Eikonoclastes, 1649). It is a defence of the king's conduct, and an account of his misfortunes from the calling of the Long Parliamont (1640) to his confinement in Caris-
brooke Castle (1648), written throughout in the first person, divided into short sections, each of which is followed by a page or two of medita-
tions and prayers; and at the end are more ex-
tended meditations upon death, and a proposed address to Parliament. The book is well written, and its piety is genuine. Gauden was a member of the Savoy Conference (see Conference, SAVOY); and according to Baxter, though he had a bitter pen, he was moderate in speech; "and, if all had been of his mind, we had been reconciled."

GAUDENTIUS, b. about 360; succeeded Philastrius as Bishop of Brixia (the present Brescia) in 387, and was still living in 410, in which year Rufinus dedicated to him his translation of the Recognitiones of Clement. A number of sermons by him, among which are ten dedicated to a cer-
tain Benevolus who by sickness was prevented from attending service in the church, are still ex-
tant, and are found in Migne: Patr. Lat., XX.

GAUL. Of the Christianization of Gaul there is a double report by the école légendaire, or anti-
grégorienne, and by the école historique, or grégori-
enne. According to the former, all the principal places of Gaul were Christianized by persons belonging to the New Testament, or closely con-
ected with it. Thus Laurence, who was bishop of Paris and his servants were put in a small boat by the Jews, and abandoned to the winds and the waves. The boat drifted ashore in Southern Gaul; and Marcellus, Aix, Tarascon, etc., were Christianized by its crew. The three disciples of Paul (Trophimus, Crescens, and Sergius Pau-
lus) preached at Arles, Vienne, and Narbonne. St. Aphrodisius, who for seven years rendered hospitality to the holy family in Egypt, founded Christianity at Béziers; Dionysius Areopagita, in Paris; Zacchaeus the publican, at Cahors, etc. The only particle of historical foundation for all these legends is 2 Tim. iv. 10, where Paul says that Crescens had gone to Gaul; but the reading is uncertain. Tischendorf and the revised Eng-
lish translation have Galatia, instead of Gaul.

The école historique ascribes the conversion of Gaul to the energy of the papal see, and finds its chief in the authority of the Emperor Tissarion, who certainly had the very best opportunity to learn the truth about it. In his Annales Francorum he says that in 250, under the reign of Decius, the Pope consecrated seven bishops, and sent them to Gaul; namely, Galian to Tours, Trophimus to Arles, Paul to Narbonne, Saturnin or Sermin to Toulouse, Denis to Paris, Stremo-
nius to Avernes, and Martial to Limousin. The progress of the undertaking was slow. At the opening of the fourth century there were very few Christians in the interior of the country; though at the beginning of the fifth century there were 250, six to Agen, 12 to Montpellier, and 12 to each of the hundred and twelve cities of Gaul enu-
merated in the Notitia provincialum et civitatum. Galliae had its bishop. Gregory corroborates his narrative by quoting the acts of the martyr St. Sermin; and his statement has, in its general outline, been confirmed by later historical and archaeological investigations, though the story of the contemporaneous arrival of the seven bishops presents some difficulties, and shows a somewhat legendary coloring.

There is one point, however, at which safe his-

torical ground is reached as early as 177; namely, Lyons. In his Hist. Eccl., Vol. IV, Eusebius trans-

cribes a letter sent by the congregations of Vienne and Lyons to the congregations of Asia and Phrygia, and narrating the martyrdom of Pothinus, Bishop of Lyons, and a number of other Christians. Another letter, addressed by the same congregations to Bishop Eleutherus of Rome, and recommending to him Ireneus, at that time presbyter at Lyons, is found in Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., V. 4). It is certain that this church of Lyons was founded by Greek missionaries from Asia Minor. It is probable that they, on their passage through Viennois and Narbonnisia, founded Christian communities also in those places, but it is doubtful how far Christianity spread; though the peculiar development of the Gallican Church, and more especially the differ-
ces between the Roman and the Gallican litur-
gies, indicates the existence in Gaul of a powerful influence different from that of Rome. The com-
plete literature on this subject has been given by E. Ruelle: Bibliographie générale de la Gaule, 1879. See the articles on Dionysius Areopa-

GAUSSEN, Etienne, b. at Nîmes in the begin-
ing of the seventeenth century; d. at Saumur, 1673; was professor there of philosophy (1651), and then of theology (1665). The school of Saumur represented at that time a more liberal conception of French Protestantism than that represented by the schools of Sedan and Montauban; and Gausen contributed much to propagate those views. His works were fre-
cently reprinted both in Holland and Germany; as, for instance, his De Utilitate Philosophiae ad Theologiam, Saumur, 1670, last edition, Halle, 1727.

GAUSSEN, Francois Samuel Robert Louis, b. at Geneva, Aug. 25, 1790; d. there June 18, 1833; was appointed pastor of Satigny in 1818, but dismissed in 1834; and from 1836 till his death taught dogmatics in the theological school of Geneva, founded by the Evangelical Society in 1831. Under the influence of Cellérié (his prede-
cessor at Satigny) and the remarkable Scotch layman Robert Haldane, he became an ardent champion of the strict orthodox Calvinism; and, though he was very far from being an agitator, he soon came in decided opposition to the rationalistic compagnie des Pasteurs of Geneva. In 1827 the compagnie tried to compel him to introduce
their rationalistic catechism in his church; but he absolutely refused. A compromise was effect-
ed, however; but when the Evangelical Society, one of whose founders was a new theological school in direct opposition to the old one taught by the Rationalists, and Merle d'Aubigné and Havernick were invited to Geneva, he left Satigny, and became a professor there. Of his works several have been translated into English; as, for instance, *Theonomy*, 1842; 14th ed. 1850 (a defense of verbal inspiration); *Geneva and Jerusalem*, 1841; *Geneva and Rome*, 1844; *Lessons for the Young*, 1860; *Canon of Holy Scripture*, 1862, abridged by Rev. Dr. Kirk, Boston, n.d.

GEBHARD II. (Truchsess von Waldburg), b. at Waldzburg, Nov. 10, 1547; d. at Strassburg, May 21, 1601; was elected Archbishop of Cologne, Dec. 5, 1577, and confirmed by the Pope, April 14, 1578. But a love-affair with Agnes of Mansfeld gave a sudden turn to his career in the service of the church. By an edict of Dec. 19, 1582, he established religious liberty and freedom of worship in his dominions; Jan. 16, 1583, he published a declaration acknowledging his own conversion to the Lutheran Church; and Feb. 2, 1583, he married Agnes of Mansfeld. But by a bull of April 1, 1583, Gregory XIII. deposed him, and declared the see of Cologne vacant; and May 22, 1583, Duke Ernst of Bavaria was elected archbishop by the chapter. The fight now began. Ernst held the metropolis of the diocese, but Gebhard was in possession of the strong fortress Bonn. The latter, however, did not receive the support he expected from the other Protestant princes of Germany. They had no sympathy for him. Tolerance and religious liberty they hated and despised as heartily as did the Roman Catholics, and a suspicion of Calvinism hovered over the unfortunate Gebhard. In January, 1584, Bonn was taken, and thereby his cause was lost. He sought aid in Holland, in England, in Germany, but everywhere in vain, and retired finally to Strassburg, where he lived and died entirely forgotten.

GAUTAMA. See BUDDHISM.

GA'ZA (strong), the present Quzeh, a city on the shore of the Mediterranean Sea, near the boundary-line between Egypt and Palestine; was a flourishing centre of Canaanite civilization in the time of Abraham, and fell by the division of the country to the lot of Judah (Josh. xv. 47). It afterwards formed one of the members of the Philistine Pentapolis, and figures prominently in the history of Samson, Solomon, the Prophets, Alexander the Great, the Ptolemies, the Maccabees, Herod the Great, and the Romans. Taken and almost destroyed in A.D. 634 by the Arabs, it was restored by the crusaders, but was again conquered by Saladin in 1170. At present it has about sixteen thousand inhabitants.

GEDDES, Janet, or Jenny, a Scottish heroine. When it was proposed, in the reign of Charles I., by advice of Archbishop Laud, to introduce the English Liturgy into Scotland, it raised a storm of indignation. The dean of Edinburgh, however, made the experiment in the Cathedral Church of St. Giles, Sunday, July 23, 1637, in the presence of the privy council and the city magistrates. According to the usual story, an old herb-woman called Janet Geddes, hearing the archbishop direct the service, threw upon which she has been sitting at the stool upon which she has been sitting at the

GEHENNA. A word used in the New Testament for "hell." Comp. Matt. v. 29, 30, x. 28, xviii. 9, xxii. 15; Mark ix. 48, 45; Luke xii. 5;
and James iii. 6. It is used in distinction from "hades" when either the torments of hell itself, or the idea of a hellish torment, is to be expressed. The passages of the New Testament show plainly that the word "gehenna" was a popular expression for "hell," of which Jesus and the apostles made use, but it would be erroneous to infer that Jesus and his apostles merely accommodated themselves to the popular expression, without believing in the actual state of the lost. The word "gehenna" is the Greek representative of a Hebrew word denoting the "Valley of Hinnom," or "of the son," or "children of Hinnom," — a deep, narrow gien to the south of Jerusalem, where the Jews offered their children to Moloch, (2 Kings xxiii. 10; Jer. vii. 31, xix. 2-6). In later times it served as the receptacle of all sorts of putrefying matter and all that defiled the holy city; and thus it became the image of the place of everlasting punishment, especially on account of its ever-burning fires. It is not quenched. PRESSEL.

GEIBEL, Johannes, b. at Hanau, April 1, 1776; d. at Lübeck, July 25, 1853; studied at Marburg, and became pastor of the Reformed Congregation in Lübeck 1797; which position he resigned in 1847. He was an eloquent and impressive preacher, an ardent adversary of the reigning rationalism, and exercised considerable influence outside of the Reformed Congregation. One of his most remarkable writings, besides his sermons, is his Widerherselung der ersten christlichen Gemeinde, Lübeck, 1840, published under the pseudonym of Philalethes. GEIBEL, Abraham, Hebrew and Talmudical scholar; b. at Frankfurt-on-the-Main, May 24, 1810; d. at Berlin, Oct. 23, 1874. He was rabbi at Wiesbaden, Breslau, Frankfort, and Berlin; belonged to the Reformed Jews, and in their interest founded, with some others, the Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie (1835). His principal publications were an essay upon the Jewish sources of the Koran (Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthum aufgenommen? 1836), monographs (Studien) upon the Jewish rabbis of the middle age, Urschrift u. Uebersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der inneren Entwicklung des Judenthums (1857), Die Sadducke u. Pharisiere (1863). Das Judenlhum und seine Geschichte (1864–71, Eng. trans. of vol. i., Lond., 1866). And posthumous are his Allgemeine Einleitung und Nachgelassene Schriften, 5 vols., edited by his son, 1875. Of these works that on the Urschrift was the chief, as it was the fruit of twenty years of study, and "marked a new departure in the methods of studying the records of Judaism.

GEIGER, Franz Tiburtius, b. at Harting, near Ratisbon, March 22, 1806; entered the order of the Franciscans in 1827, and became professor of theology at Lucerne in 1792. Lucerne was the seat of the papal nuncios, and the centre of Roman-Catholic Switzerland, and from here Geiger exercised a considerable influence on the religious men of the country; his writings by AMMON (Erlangen, 1826), AUGUST STOEKER (Strassburg, 1834), [DACHEUX (Paris, 1877), also by Dr. P. DE LORENZI, in his edition of Geiger's Ausgewählte Schriften, vols. I., II., Trier, 1881.] C. SCHMIDT.

GELASIIUS is the name of two popes. — Gelasius i. (March 1, 492–Nov. 19, 496) in his controversy with the Constantinopolitan See concerning Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople, whom Pope Felix III. had excommunicated because he leaned towards Monophysitism, but whose name was still retained in the diptychs of the Constantinopolitan Church. In 495 Gelasius repeated the excommunication, and cursed all who did not accept it. The controversy became so much the more acrimonious as the real question at issue was one of precedence. It was not the orthodoxy of his predecessor, but the supremacy of his see, which Gelasius fought for; and, in the numerous letters he wrote during the controversy, he pushed his arrogance to an extreme, and set forth claims hitherto unheard of. He demanded the right to receive appeals from everywhere in the world, though he allowed no appeal from Rome to any other court; the right to confirm or cancel the decrees of ultramontanist feelings and ideas, both by his lectures and by a great number of minor pamphlets, collected in eight volumes by RÄBER. See WIDMEN: Franz Geiger, Lucerne, 1843.

GEILER, Johann, b. at Kaisersberg, near Schaffhausen, March 16, 1446; d. at Strassburg, March 10, 1510; studied philosophy and the humanities at Freiburg, but was by Gerson's writings drawn towards theology; went to Basel in 1471, and became doctor theologiae there in 1475; returned to Freiburg as professor of theology, but removed in 1478 to Strassburg, where he spent the rest of his life as preacher at the cathedral. Towards the end of the fifteenth century a tendency became apparent almost everywhere among the preachers to throw off the yoke of scholasticism, and to give to the sermon a freer course, a greater life, a deeper impressiveness. This tendency did not originate among the Humanists. It sprung from a feeling which the rapid progress of the printing-press, and the effect it had on the people, awakened within the church itself, that it was necessary to establish a much more intimate relation between the pulpit and the mass of the people, if the former should not entirely lose its hold on the latter. One of the most remarkable representatives of this tendency is Geiler von Kaisersberg. He took his texts not from Scripture only, but also from Gerson's works, from Brant's Narrenschiff, from a barber's song, from everywhere; and the text chosen he applied directly, without flinching, to the real life which presented itself before his pulpit, in form which our taste may now and then find somewhat coarse, but which on his time produced the deepest impression. His sermons were often taken down while he delivered them, then translated into Latin (often with omission of the facies which could not be translated), and then again into High German. Thus there exists a great number of collections of his sermons, more or less genuine; but all of them, even the tamest Latin renderings, show the same fundamental character. See works upon Geiler's life and writings by AMMON (Erlangen, 1826), AUGUST STOEKER (Strassburg, 1834), [DACHEUX (Paris, 1877), also by Dr. P. DE LORENZI, in his edition of Geiler's Ausgewählte Schriften, vols. I., II., Trier, 1881.] C. SCHMIDT.
GELASIIUS OF CYZICUS. 858

Genealogy.

1 This article is reprinted by permission of the American Sunday-School Union, from Robert's Bible Dictionary (Phila. 3d ed., 1851), but somewhat enlarged, and the literature added.

Ita genuineness is contested; but though it may have been begun by Damasus, and finished by Hornissada, the bulk of the work seems, nevertheless, to belong to Gelasius. Among the books forbidden are the works of Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Ambrosius, Lactantius, and Origen. His writings are found in AND. TITHE: Epist. Rom. Pontif., Brunschberg, 1867; his life, in Liber Pontif., vol. i.; and in JAFFE: Reg. Pont. Rom., p. 33. — Gelasius II. (1118–Jan. 19, 1119) was seized, immediately after his election, by the faction of the Frangipani, and liberated only by the rising of the people of Rome. But he had hardly escaped the Frangipani before a still greater danger began to loom up. As soon as Henry V. heard that a new pope had been elected without his consent being asked for, he hastened to Italy, and March 2, 1118, he entered Rome. Afraid of being unseated, he found it necessary, in order to prevent theChess, and of debates between heathenphilosophers and Christian bishops.

GELLERT, Christian Fürchtegott, b. at Hainich, Saxony, July 4, 1715; d. at Leipzig, Dec. 13, 1769; studied theology at Leipzig, and was appointed professor extraordinary there in 1751. He wrote comedies, fables, essays on morals and aesthetics, and hymns. His Fables was one of the most popular books which the German literature produced in the eighteenth century, and it is still read. His hymns made almost an equal impression: they were translated into Dutch, Danish, Bohemian, Russian, etc., and were praised even by the Roman Catholics. It is true that they have been severely criticised; but no disparagement has been able to take Gellert out of the hearts of the people, nor his poems out of the church. [One of his hymns, "Jesus lives," is found in many English hymn-books.] His collected works have been frequently reprinted, as in 10 vols. at Leipzig, 1867.

His Life was written by J. A. Cramer, Leipzig, 1774. A Gellertbuch was published in Dresden, 1854.

GEM. See Precious Stones.

GEMARA. See Talmud.

Genealogy. The matter of pedigree was deemed of great importance by the Hebrews and ancient peoples generally, as at present among the Arabs. Genealogical lists are interspersed all through the historical books of the Old Testament. They are called "the book of the generation of," etc. They answer, also, a spiritual purpose. They prove the faithfulness of God in favoring the increase of the race, in accordance with his command, in keeping his promise to Abraham and his seed, in raising up priests to minister in his sanctuary, and, finally, in sending, when the set time had come and all things were ready, his Son into the world. As far as the Bible is concerned, the preservation of these genealogical lists was for the authentication of Christ's descent. But the historical use is by no means to be ignored: indeed, in proportion as we grasp its value shall we attain conviction of the perfect reality of the earthly descent of Christ from the seed of David, according to prophecy. "The genealogies of Scripture," says Professor G. Rawlinson, "are dry and forbidding as their first aspect, will well repay a careful and scholarly study. They are like an arid range of bare and stony mountains, which, when minutely examined, reveals to the investigator mines of emerald or diamond. Only let the searcher bear in mind that where all is dark to him it may be reserved for future inquirers to let in upon the darkness a flood of light" (The Origin of Nations, p. 166).

The first biblical genealogy is Gen. iv. 16–24. It gives the descendants of Cain. The following chapter gives the family of Seth. The tenth and eleventh chapters, though the ordinary reader might pass them over because they seem to consist of mere unimportant names, are regarded by ethnologists as invaluable, since they contain a history of the dispersion of the nations in prehistoric times. The first eight chapters of 1 Chronicles are devoted to genealogical accounts, beginning with Adam, because, as it is stated, "all Israel were reckoned by genealogies" (1 Chron. ix. 1). It is, however, to be observed that these several lists are not in all cases records of direct descent; though perhaps, in the majority of instances, they are there, for all they are not sufficient to determine the length of any period, since, in many cases, the list the writer has transcribed contains only prominent names. Women are named occasionally, when there is something remarkable about them, or when any right or property is transmitted through them (see Gen. xi. 29; Exod. vi. 23; 1 Chron. ii. 4; Luke i. 5, etc.). Another feature is, that these records especially concern the line of the chosen seed and the tribe and family from which our Lord sprung. Seth's family is more fully stated than Cain's, Abraham's than Lot's, Isaac's than Ishmael's, etc. The lists are both ascending and descending. For the former see 1 Chron. vi. 33–43, Ez. vii. 1–5; for the descending see Ruth iv. 18–22, 1 Chron. iii. The descending scale is likely to take in the collateral branches. There are many clerical errors in these lists.

But, notwithstanding these alterations and abridgments, it is capable of proof that the Bible presents us transcripts from certain official records. They bear the evidence of substantial truth. That such records existed is indicated rather than proved. Thus the assignments of the temple-service by David we may regard as real. In the reign of Rehoboam, Iddo wrote a book on genealogies (2 Chron. xiii. 15). From 2 Chron.
xxvi. 18-19 we learn that in Hezekiah’s day there existed genealogies of the priests, at all events. The lists in Ezra and Nehemiah prove that such lists and others survived the captivity. It is a monstrous assumption to say that they were forged. Lord Hervey (in Smith’s Dictionary of the Bible) points out an incidental allusion to them. The lists of that time were used (there are only nine names for a period of eight hundred and thirty-three years). They coincided until David; when Matthew takes the reigning line through Solomon, Luke the younger and inferior line by David’s son Nathan. A more serious difficulty is, that names do not appear in the same place in the two lists. Luke gives twenty-one names between David and Zerubbabel, Matthew only fifteen; and all the names except that of Shealtiel (Salathiel) are different. Luke gives seventeen names between Zerubbabel and Joseph; Matthew only nine; and all the names are different. The greatest difference is, that Matthew calls Joseph the son of Jacob, while Luke calls him the son of Heli, or Eli. He cannot have been naturally the son of both; and it is not likely that the two names are meant for one and the same person. Hence the following theories:

1. The oldest explanation assumes one, or perhaps two, levirate marriages in the family of Joseph; i.e., a marriage of a man to the childless widow of his elder brother; the children of the second marriage being reckoned as the legal descendants of the first husband. Heli and Jacob may have been brothers, or half-brothers (sons of the same mother, but of different fathers), successively married to the mother of Joseph, who, according to law, was registered by Luke as the son of Heli, though naturally the son of Jacob, as recorded by Matthew. But this view involves inaccuracy in one or the other of the two genealogies.

2. Matthew gives the legal or royal genealogy of Joseph; Luke, the private line of Joseph. The one gives the heirship to the throne of David and Solomon (the jus successionis); the other, the actual descent, through Nathan and private persons, from the jussanguinis. Hence the following view is entertained by many interpreters:—

3. Matthew gives the genealogy of Joseph; Luke, the genealogy of Mary. Heli may have been the father of Mary, and the father-in-law of Joseph, and consequently the grandfather of Jesus. Luke, writing for Gentiles, and proving that Christ was the seed of the woman, traces the natural or real pedigree of Jesus through his mother, Mary, in the line of Nathan, and indicates this by the parenthetical remark, “Jesus was the son of Heli,” or his grandson by the mother’s side. Mary is always called by the Jews “the daughter of Heli.” Matthew, writing for Jews, gives the legal pedigree of Jesus (which was always reckoned in the male line) through Joseph, his legal father, in the line of Solomon. This explanation is the easiest, and has been adopted by Luther, Grotius, Bengel, Olshausen, Ebrard, Wieseler, Robinson, Gardiner, Lange, Plumptre, Weiss, Godet. It is supported by the
fact that in Matthew's history of the infancy of Jesus is most prominent; in Luke's account, Mary. The Davidic descent of Jesus is a mark of the Messiah, and is clearly taught in the prophecy, and also in Rom. i. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 8; Heb. vii. 14; John vii. 42; Acts xiii. 23. If we take this explanation, Jesus was in a double sense the son of David,—in law and in fact, from his reputed father, and from his natural mother.


GENESIS. See PENTATEUCH.

GENESIUS, a comedian, who, while acting the part of a candidate for Christian baptism, was suddenly converted, acknowledged his conviction, was put to torture, and beheaded (285), and then inscribed among the saints of the Roman Church. In festival fall at that time of B. S. A.; and Butler, Lives of the Saints, on date.

GENEVA (French, Genève; German, Genf), the largest city of Switzerland, numbering 68,155 inhabitants in 1876, and the capital of the canton of the same name; was, before the period of the Reformation, subject to the bishop of the diocese of Geneva, who, again, was an immediate vassal of the German emperor. There was, however, always dispute between the bishops and the counts of Genevois, later on between the bishops and the dukes of Savoy, concerning the possession of the city; and there was within the city itself, as within most medievals towns of commercial and industrial consequence, a party which strove for liberty and independence. Backed by Freiburg and Bern, with which alliances were concluded respectively in 1519 and 1526, the party of liberty finally gained the ascendency. The city constituted itself a republic, expelled the bishop, adopted the Reformation, and succeeded in vindicating its independence against the insidious attacks of the Duke of Savoy until 1798, when it was incorporated with France. In 1814, however, it regained its independence; and, its territory having been increased with some French and Savoy communities, it joined the Swiss confederation as the twenty-second canton. The area of the canton comprises only 107 square miles, with 98,352 inhabitants in 1876.

The first seeds of the Reformation were sown in Geneva by the French translation of the Bible by Le Fèvre d'Étaples (Faber Stapulensis); and already in 1528 the bishop, the Duke of Savoy, and the Pope were busily engaged in punishing people who possessed or read le livre maudit: they were fined, or scourged, or beheaded. In September, 1532, Farel arrived at Geneva, preceded by Froment, followed by Viret; and in March, 1533, the Reformed doctrine was allowed to be preached and practised in the city. In July, same year, the bishop, Pierre de la Baume, renounced his residence from Geneva to Annecy. A violent Roman-Catholic re-action took place in the following year; but it was of short duration. In 1535 the Reformation was adopted as the religion of the State; and in October, 1836, Calvin arrived. He soon found himself at the head of the whole movement, political as well as religious; and by his iron hand a theocracy of a very stern type was established. The Reformed doctrine became a civil duty, and dogmatical deviations were treated as treason. Ecclesiastical discipline was carried even into the routine of daily life, and a breach of its dictates was punished as a crime. The transition proved too sudden, however. A party was formed, not with any tendency towards Romanism, but for the purpose of sustaining a greater measure of liberty, and in 1538 Calvin was expelled. But it soon became apparent that his austere regimen was a necessity, if Geneva really should fulfil her mission as a frontier fortress against Rome. The city was crowded with refugees from Italy, Spain, France, and England. Each new-comer brought a new system of Protestantism along with him; and the liberty very soon degenerated into a laxity, which the Roman Catholics were not slow to avail themselves of. Calvin was recalled, and the severe order returned with the dictator. Under his rule, and, indeed, for a long time after his death, Geneva stood as the "Rome of Protestantism," the "moral capital of the half of Christendom," forming the strongest and loftiest characters, and sending forth the noblest and most vigorous impulses. It was not only a place of refuge to those who were persecuted, but also a centre of active labor. The English version, called the Geneva Bible, received its name from its being made in that city by English refugees. (See English Bible Versions, p. 734.)

Under such circumstances it was only natural that the Roman-Catholic Church should consider it one of her great objects to convert Geneva; and many attempts, insidious, daring, foolish attempts, were made, as, for instance, that by François de Sales. But none was more cunningly planned, and more patiently carried out, than that of which our own time has seen the issue. The inhabitants of the territory added to the city in 1814 in order to form the canton of Geneva were exclusively Roman Catholics, and the population of the whole canton was thus nearly equally divided between the two churches. Here was a chance for Rome, and she knew how to improve it. Disputes between the priests and the pastors were of frequent occurrence, and sometimes of great danger to the republic, as, after the fall of Napoleon, a strong current of re-action, both political and religious, had set in everywhere in Europe; and it proved easy for the Roman-Catholic party to bring the influence of France, Russia, and Austria, to bear against their Protestant adversaries. The dissolution of the Holy Alliance, however, and the revolution of 1830, gave the Protestants freer hands; but then the secret work of the Romanists in the social foundation of the State began to show its results. From this day of the annexation of the rural territories, the Roman clergy exerted itself to prevent an amalgamation between the two denominations. Mixed marriages were prohibited; neighborly courtesy was discouraged; the two confessions seldom met each other, except when doing military service. At the same time a Roman-Catholic immigration was highly favored. Laborers, mechanics, retail dealers, etc., were imported in considerable numbers, and so-
tled in the city, a propaganda at Lyons furnishing
funds; and the Roman Church was soon able to
take up the contest with the Protestant party in
the political field. The fight actually began,
stirred up by the priests. But in the course of a
generation the march of affairs took an unex-
pected turn. The young voters were sent to the
polls by their confessor, and to the political med-
iums; and official matters began between the two
confessions; and confessional matters could, of
course, not be excluded. The result was that sud-
denly there appeared within the pale of the
Roman-Catholic community a decided opposition
to the ultramontans. This new party, the
Liberal-Catholics, invited in 1873 Father Hyas
chene to preach at Geneva; and, as the Genevese
laws grant to every congregation the right of
electing its pastor itself, many Roman-Catholic
congregations chose Old Catholic priests, who re-
jected the dogma of papal infallibility, and were
mailed.

The history, however, of the Church of Geneva,
is by no means confined to her duel with the
Roman Church: on the contrary, considerable
changes of organization and a significant doctrinal
development have taken place. The organiza-
tion of the sixteenth century remained un-
altered for a long time, or underwent only minor
modifications, until, in 1846, a radical change
was effected, amounting almost to a revolution.

Up to 1846 the pastors were chosen by the Vénéra-
ble Compagnie des Pasteurs, one of the institutions
of Calvin, which also had in hand the adminis-
tration of all religious affairs of the church, and
exercised great influence on the academy and the
schools. But from that year the authority of the
compagnie was confined to questions of worship
proper; while the other branches of the adminis-
tration of the church were placed under the
consistoire, composed of twenty-five lay-members
and six pastors, and elected by the people; and
the pastors were chosen by the congregations.

At the same time began that doctrinal differen
to develop, which finally led to the formation of the
Evangelical Society, and the foundation of a new
theological school; for which see the articles on
GAGNERELLE D'AUBIGNÉ, SOCIETE EVA
GÉLIQUE, etc.

LIT. — Mémoirs et documents publiés par la So-
ciété d'histoire et d'archéologie de Genève, 1840 sqq.;
J. GABEREL: Histoire de l'Eglise de Genève, 3 vols.;
AMI BONI: Mémoirs pour servir à l'histoire du receu
religieux, 3 vols.; E. GUERS: Le premier receu et la
première église indépendante à Genève; ROGET: La
question catholique à Genève; FLEURY: Histoire de
l'église de Genève depuis les temps les plus anciens
jusqu'en 1822, Geneva, 1829 sqq.

GENEVIEVE, St., b. 419 or 425, at Nanterre;
d. in Paris, Jan. 3, 512; became the patroness of
Paris by averting the attack of the Huns, under
Attila, from that city by her prayers; built the
first church over the tomb of St. Denis; and lies
buried in the Church of St. Geneviève, in Paris,
which, however, twice (in 1729 and in 1830) has
been for a time transformed into a national pan-
theon. The earliest life of her, written shortly
after her death, was published in Paris, in 1657,
by Charpentier. See Act. Sanct., and BUTLER,
Lives of the Saints, Jan. 3.

GENEVIEVE, Canons of St. (also called Canons
of the Congregation of France), a congregation
of regular canons founded in 1614 by Charles
Fauré, from the abbey of St. Vincent de Sensis,
who, by the Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld, was
called to Paris, and successfully carried through
a reform of the abbey of St. Geneviève there. A
female community of the order (the Daughters
of St. Geneviève, or the Miramons) was founded
in 1686 by Francisca de Bisagno, and in 1687
was added to the congregation founded by Marie de Mira-
monr. See Constitutions Canonicarum regularem
Congregationis Gallicana, Paris, 1676.

GENNADIUS MASSILIENSIS lived, according to
notices drawn from his own works, in Gaul
during the time of Bishop Gelasius of Rome
(492–496) and the Byzantine Emperor Anastatius
(491–518), and was a presbyter, not a bishop,
at Marseilles. He understood Greek, was well
versed both in Eastern and Western ecclesiastical
literature, translated several Greek works into
Latin, and wrote original works on all heresies,—
against Nestorius, against Pelagianism, against
Semi-Pelagianism, such as this view prevailed in
Gaul, and more especially at Marseilles, at his
time.

WAGENMANN.

GENNADIUS, Patriarch of Constantinople
(1453–59), was one of the most prolific philosop-
ical and theological writers of his age, and one
of the last representative of Byzantine learning. Of
his personal life very little is known. He seems
to have been born in Constantinople about 1400.
His true name was Georgios Scholarios. Having
entered the court-service, he was made an imperia-
lar councilor, and accompanied in 1453 the Emperor
Johannes to the Council of Ferrara-Florence.
As a layman, he could not take part in the dis-
cussions of the council; but he presented to it
three elaborate speeches in favor of the projected
union between the Greek and Latin churches,
and addressed also his own countrymen in a
separate work on the subject. After his return
the Byzantine Emperor Anastatius, against Pelagianism, against
Semi-Pelagianism, such as this view prevailed in
Gaul, and more especially at Marseilles, at his
time.

WAGENMANN.

GENNADIUS, Patriarch of Constantinople
(1453–59), was one of the most prolific philosop-
ical and theological writers of his age, and one
of the last representative of Byzantine learning. Of
his personal life very little is known. He seems
to have been born in Constantinople about 1400.
His true name was Georgios Scholarios. Having
entered the court-service, he was made an imperia-
lar councilor, and accompanied in 1453 the Emperor
Johannes to the Council of Ferrara-Florence.
As a layman, he could not take part in the dis-
cussions of the council; but he presented to it
three elaborate speeches in favor of the projected
union between the Greek and Latin churches,
and addressed also his own countrymen in a
separate work on the subject. After his return
both to Greece, however, he entirely changed his views
of the union, and became one of its most decided
adversaries, speaking and writing against it with
passionate obstinacy. This change also disturbed
his relations with the emperor; and in 1448 he
retired to the monastery of Pantokrator, and
became a monk, though still continuing his lit-
ery activity. As Mohammed II., after the cap-
ture of Constantinople, demanded that the
vacant patriarchal chair should be filled, Georgios
Scholarios, who as a monk had assumed the name
GEORGE, St.

Gennesaret is the name of a lake of Palestine, also called the “Sea of Galilee”; of a plain along the north-western shore of the lake, generally called the “Land of Gennesaret,” and of a town situated in the plain. The name is Chinneroth, or Chinnereth, in the Old Testament (Num. xxxiv. 11; Josh. xi. 2; 1 Kings xv. 20), and Gennesaret in the Apocrypha (1 Macc. xi. 67), but Gennesaret in the New Testament (Matt. ix. 1; Mark vi. 58; Luke v. 1-11). The town was still in existence in the beginning of the fourteenth century. For the lake and the land, see Palestine.

Genuode, Eugène de, b. at Montélimart, 1792; d. in the Iles d’Hyères, 1849; played a part in the re-action, political and religious, after the restoration of the Bourbons in 1814, by the side of Chateaubriand, De Maistre, Bonald, and Laennec; edited various political papers; was ordained a priest in 1835; published a translation of the Bible and of Thomas à Kempis’ Imitation of Christ; and wrote La raison du christianisme (Paris, 1834-35, evidence drawn from all sources to the truth of Christianity, a large part of it compiled in 12 vols.), Servants (1849), L’histoire d’une âme, a kind of confession, etc. A biography of him was published at Paris by a former colleague in journalism.

Gentilis, Giovanni Valentino, b. at Cosenza, in Calabria, about 1520; beheaded at Bern, Sept. 10, 1569. He embraced the Reformation, fled from Italy, and settled at Geneva. Remembering the fates of Servetus, he signed the confession of faith which the magistrates demanded every member of the Italian community at Geneva to subscribe to, but continued, nevertheless, to propagate his antitrinitarian views. He was cited as an apostate by the council, and excommunicated and banished from the city; and was returned once more to Switzerland, was seized at Bern, imprisoned for heresy, and beheaded. An account of his trial was published by Benedict Aréus. See Tschirch: Die protest. Antitrinitarier, Heidelberg, 1839-44, vol. ii. pp. 516 sqq.

Gentillet, Innocent, was b. at Vienne in Dauphiné, but fled to Geneva on account of the persecutions against the Reformed. In 1576 he returned to France, and was at one time president of the Parliament of Grenoble: but in 1585 he was again expelled, and died at Genoa at an unknown date. He wrote Apologia pro christianis Galil. religione evang. (1578), which is considered the best apology for the Reformation ever written, and Le bureau du concile de Trente (1598), an irrefragable argument against the Council of Trent. Both works have often been reprinted.

Gentilly, Council of (767), was one of those mixed synods, composed of bishops and barons, which were frequently held by the Frankish kings.

Gentillectentes. See Catechetica.

Geoffrey of Monmouth, a famous English chronicler; b. at Monmouth in the early part of the twelfth century; created Bishop of St. Asaph, 1152; d. 1154. His fame rests upon a history of early Britain, entitled Chronicon sive Historia Britunnm. The work has been a mine from which later chroniclers drew, and was considered an authority in Europe. The first printed edition appeared at Paris, 1568. An English translation by A. Thompson, London, 1718, has been revised by J. A. Giles, London, 1842. See Wright: Essays on Archb. Subjects, London, 1861 (vol. 1).

George, St., descended from a distinguished family in Cappadocia; entered the Roman army, and rose rapidly; but left it with open protest when the persecution of Diocletian began; and was beheaded at Nicomedia, April 23, 303. According to some he was the person mentioned in Eusebius (Hist. Ecc., VIII. 5), who tore down the imperial proclamation, and was punished by being roasted over a slow fire. The acts of his martyrdom are evidently spurious. Baronius thinks that the Arians falsified them. Many features of the legends about him, as, for instance, the slaying of the dragon, show a decidedly mythological character, and indicate that they originated as symbols. For these reasons the very existence of St. George has been impugned, as, for instance, by Calvin and by Pegge in the eighteenth century. Nevertheless, the worship of him is very old, both in the Eastern and in the Western Church. In the Eastern Church he is first mentioned in an inscription in a church at El-Deir in Southern Syria, copied by Burckhardt and Porter, and explained by Hogg, who fixes its date at 346. In the Western Church he is first mentioned in the decrees of the Council of Rome (494), which condemned his acts as corrupted by heretics, though vindicating his honor as a true martyr of the Church. The worship of him, however, is not only old, it is also extensive; and the legends grew luxuriantly, absorbing, as it would seem, very different elements. The story of St. George and the dragon occurs for the first time in a fully-developed form in the Historia Lombardica, or “Golden Legend,” by Jacob de Voragine, Archbishop of Geneva 1280. At that time his connection with England was already firmly established. According to William of Malmsbury (Gesta Reg. Angl.,
II.), he appeared in the battle of Antioch (June 28, 1080), and aided the Franks to overthrow the Saracens. The Normans under Robert, the son of William the Conqueror, then adopted him as their patron. As he continued to appear in aid of the Norman crusaders, a Council of Oxford (1222) made his day a festival throughout England; and after the battle of Calais (1349) he came to be considered the patron saint of the country, and the order of the garter is said by some to have been instituted (1350) under his patronage. See Heylyn: History of St. George of Cappadocia, Lond., 1631; Milner: Inquiry into the History of St. George, 1792; J. Hogg: Notes on St. George the Martyr, Lond., 1862.

GEORGE III, Prince of Anhalt; b. at Dessau, Aug. 13, 1507; d. there Oct. 17, 1553. He studied at Leipzig; was ordained a priest in 1524, and appointed provost of Magdeburg in 1526. He was at that time a true son of the Roman Church, and considered the Reformation a mere innovation. But he considered it necessary to make a thorough study of the Bible and the history of the Church in order to meet successfully the "Lutheran sectarians;" and the result of this study was his conversion. In 1530 he subscribed to the Augsburg Confession; and in 1534 the Lutheran Church was established in the principality of Anhalt. At the instance of Duke Maurice, Prince George assumed in 1544 the administration of the diocese of Merseburg; and in the following year he was consecrated bishop by Luther. During the Smalcalid war he defended himself in Merseburg; but, after the establishment of the Leipzig Interim, he retired to Dessau. See O. G. Schmidt: Georg von Anhalt, in Meurer: Leben der Altzeit d. luth. Kirche, which also gives information about the writings of George III.

O. PLITT.

GEORGE, Margrave of Brandenburg-Ansbach; b. at Osnobach, March 4, 1484; d. there Dec. 17, 1543; embraced early the Reformation, and maintained very intimate relations with Luther. In 1527 he became sole ruler of the margraviate, and immediately introduced the new doctrine in the country; and perhaps no other German prince contributed as much to the success of the Reformation, partly by the boldness with which he spoke its cause in the diets, partly by the energy with which he labored for it under all circumstances. See Schulze: Leben und Geschichte des Marg. G., Francfort, 1729, and Luther's Briefe an Marg. G.

GEORGE OF CAPPADOCIA, likewise called George the Fuller, was appointed Bishop of Alexandria in 356, after the banishment of Athanasius, and entered the city at the head of a military force. In 361 he was most savagely massacred by the Pagans. He was a rank Arian, a grasping and peremptory nature, a character by no means without blemish; but the picture which the orthodox writers give of him is very exaggerated, and sometimes even self-contradictory.

GEORGE THE PISIDIAN lived in the middle of the seventh century, and was a deacon at the Church of St. Sophia in Constantinople. He wrote a number of long poems of historical, philosophical, and religious contents; but, though he was much appreciated by the later Byzantine writers, most of his productions remain in manuscript. The Hexameron and De vanitate vitae were published, with a Latin translation, by Morel, Paris, 1584, and are found in Bibliotheca Patrum, Paris, 1654, vol. XIV.

GEORGIAN VERSIONS. See Bible Versions, p. 286.

GEORGIUS, Bishop of Laodicea in Phrygia, was born at Alexandria, and received orders there. In the controversy between Bishop Alexander of Alexandria and the Arians he tried to mediate, but was excommunicated by Alexander for Arianism. Made Bishop of Laodicea by the Arians, he could not agree with them, either, and became, together with Bishop Basil of Ancyra, founder of the Semi-Arian party. Under Con-
stansius the doctrine of the Semi-Arians became the theology of the court; and when the third synod of Sirmium (358) confirmed this doctrine and the anathemas of the synod of Ancyra, the breach between the Arians and the Semi-Arians became complete. Amongst the works of Georgius are mentioned a life of Eusebius of Emesa, and an essay against the Manicheans.

GEORGIIUS SYNCELLUS received his surname from his position as synallus, or privy councillor, to Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, in the middle of the eighth century. He wrote a Chronographia, extending from Adam to the time of Diodelian, and valuable especially on account of the frequent extracts it gives from other writers. It was first edited by Goar, Paris, 1652, best by Dindorf, 1829, 2 vols.

GERBERON, Gabriel, b. at St. Calais, between Angers and Chartres, Aug. 12, 1628; d. at St. Denis, March 29, 1711; entered the congregation of St. Maur in 1649, and became not only one of the most prolific writers of that order (his works numbering a hundred and eleven), but also one of the most remarkable of the critical tendency. He taught philosophy and theology in various schools, after 1675, at Corbie near Amiens. While there he published (1676, at Brussels) his Miroir de la pieëtë chrëtiennë, which by several archbishops was considered a revival of the five condemned propositions of Jansen. On the instigation of the Jesuits an order was issued for his imprisonment; but he fled, first to the Netherlands, afterwards to Brussels, where he edited the works of Bajus, and Jansen's letters to St. Cyran. He was discovered, however, in 1703, and imprisoned in the citadel of Amiens till 1707, when he was brought to St. Denis, after having been compelled to recant, and sign the condemnation of the five propositions of Jansen. But he never yielded completely. Shortly before his death he dictated Le vain triomphë des Jésuits, whose publication was prevented, however, by his superiors.

GERBERT, Martin, b. at Horb, on the Neckar, Aug. 13, 1730; d. at Sanct Blasien, in the Black Forest, May 3, 1793; was educated in the Jesuit academy at Freiburg; entered the monastery of Sanct Blasien in 1757; was ordained priest in 1744, and elected abbot in 1749. From 1759 to 1782 he travelled in Germany, France, and Italy, and published a Latin description of his voyage, afterwards translated into German. He was a learned historian, and wrote, among other works, a Historia ignis sylique O. S. B., Cologne, 1785-88.

GERHARD, St., b. at Staffes (Stablecin), in the diocese of Namur, 890; d. in the monastery of Brougne (Bronium), Oct. 3, 956; retired early from the gay service of the Count of Namur, on account of a vision which came to him in a dream; and, having built a new church and a monastery at Brougne (916), he entered the monastery of St. Denis, and became a monk. Ordained a presbyter in 928, he returned to Brougne, and spent the rest of his life in reforming monasteries. He was canonized by Innocent II. See Act. Sanct., Oct. 3, and F. Güntner, Das Leben d. h. Gerhard de Brogne, Halle, 1857.

GERHARD, Paul, b. at Grünfainichen, in the electorate of Saxony, March 12, 1607; d. at Lübben, June 7, 1676. He studied at Wittenberg; was made preacher at Mittenwalde in 1651, and at the Church of St. Nicolai, in Berlin, in 1637, but was dismissed in 1666, because he refused to subscribe to the edicts of June 2, 1662, and Sept. 16, 1664, considering them as attempts to unite the Lutheran and the Reformed churches. In 1667, however, he was made Archdeacon of Lübben. He is generally considered as the greatest hymn-writer Germany has produced. In his sweet songs, Christianity does not appear as something imposed to or in conflict with human nature, but, on the contrary, as the strongest, soundest, purest, and truest form of humanity. His form is often artistically perfect; and yet the expression comes so naturally, and the rhythm flows so easily, that his verses remain in the memory after the first hearing. The first collection of his hymns are those by Cruger (in his Praxis Pietatis Melica, 1648) and J. G. Ebeling (Berlin, 1666); the last and best those by Wackernagel (Stuttgart, 1843, last edition, Guterslohe, 1876) and C. F. Becker (Leipzig, 1851). These last-mentioned collections contain good biographies of him. See also by Karl Godecke (Leipzig, 1877) and Karl Gerok (Stuttgart, 1873), and Lives by WILDEHANH.
GEROCH.


[Many of Gerhardt's hymns have been incorporated in our collections of hymns or of devotional poetry; and one of them, O sacred Head, now in the assembly of the States-generals (1789); became a reformer as yet. In 1126 he entered the order of the Carthusians; he was long associated with the people of his native town to accept the nomination for bishop in 418; adopted immediately after the most rigorous ascetic practices; visited England in 429 to aid the orthodox against the Pelagians; and went in the year of his death to Ravenna to interfere in favor of the Armoricans. He enjoyed a greater fame during his lifetime, and is still much revered in France. See Act. Socit., July 31.

GERMAIN D'AUXERRE, St., b. at Auxerre, 380; d. at Ravenna, July 31, 448; was forced by the people of his native city to accept the nomination for bishop in 418; adopted immediately after the most rigorous ascetic practices; visited England in 429 to aid the orthodox against the Pelagians; and went in the year of his death to Ravenna to interfere in favor of the Armoricans. He enjoyed a great fame during his lifetime, and is still much revered in France. See Act. Socit., July 31.

GERMAN CATHOLICS (Deutsch Katholiken). Oct. 15, 1844, there appeared in the Sächsische Vaterlandsblätter an article in which the Bishop of Treves was openly accused of seducing his flock to idolatry by his exhibition of the holy host; and an appeal was made to the lower clergy not to countenance the proceedings of the bishop. The author of the article was an entirely obscure person, one Johannes Ronge, a Roman-Catholic priest, formerly a chaplain at Grottkau, in the county of Neisse, Saxony, but suspended on account of a previous article in the same paper, and now living at Lanrahtte, near the Polish frontier, teaching a children's school in a Protestant neighborhood. But the effect of the article was like that of a spark in a powder-mine. Fifty thousand copies of the article were immediately sold, and tokens of sympathy of every kind and description showered down upon the author.

Ronge's appeal of separation had already been anticipated and carried into effect in another place. At Schneidemühl, a small town on the northern frontier of Posen, one Czersky had formed a community, which on Oct. 18, 1844, broke off from the Roman Church, and constituted itself as an independent congregation, under the name of Christ Catholics, and with Czersky for their pastor. To lead these two currents into one common stream was a problem of the greatest importance, but not without peculiar difficulties.

GERLACH, Otto von, b. in Berlin, April 12, 1801; d. there Oct. 24, 1849. He studied, first law at Heidelberg and Göttingen, then theology in his native city, and was appointed preacher at the Elizabeth Church there in 1854, and court chaplain in 1847. He and his equally distinguished brother, Gen. von Gerlach, an aide-de-camp of King Frederick William IV.) were closely associated with Hengstenberg in the revival of orthodoxy and piety in Prussia. He translated Awake, thou that sleepest (by Wesley), the Reformed Pastor (by Baxter), and the Charity and the Church (by Chalmers), and wrote a very useful popular commentary on the Bible, of which a collected edition appeared in Berlin, 1847-53, 6 vols. RUD. KÖGEL.

GERLE, Christophe Antoine, b. in Auvergne, 1740; entered the order of the Carthusians; became a follower of Robespierre, but was beheaded after his fall. More remarkable, however, than his political career, was the part he played among the adherents of Catherine Théot, the old woman who pretended that she was about to bear the Word, etc. He occupies a prominent place in David's picture, Le Serment du Jeu de Paume. The date of his death is unknown. See Michelet: Hist. de la Révolution française, vol. vii.
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The Christ Catholics rejected the celibacy of the clergy, the use of the Latin language in divine service, the doctrines of purgatory, transubstantiation, etc.; but they retained the seven sacraments, the Nicene Creed, etc. The German Catholics, who had formed their first independent congregation at Breslau, March 9, 1845, with Rouxe as their pastor, went much farther in their deviation from Romanism, and had, for instance, made alterable changes in the Nicene Creed. A common council was held at Leipzig, Easter, 1845, and delegates were present from twenty-seven congregations. But at the council it soon became evident that the watch-er of secession, congregation at Breslau, March 9, 1845, with silence in this confession.

"Away from Rome," was about the only thing service, the doctrines of purgatory, transubstan-

made considerable changes in the Nicene Creed. 1845, and delegates were present from twenty-rouge as their astor, went much farther in their deviation from omanism, and had, for instance, made alterable changes in the Nicene Creed. A common council was held at Leipzig, Easter, 1845, and delegates were present from twenty-seven congregations. But at the council it soon became evident that the watch-er of secession, congregation at Breslau, March 9, 1845, with silence in this confession.

"Away from Rome," was about the only thing service, the doctrines of purgatory, transubstan-

made considerable changes in the Nicene Creed. 1845, and delegates were present from twenty-rouge as their astor, went much farther in their deviation from omanism, and had, for instance, made alterable changes in the Nicene Creed. A common council was held at Leipzig, Easter, 1845, and delegates were present from twenty-seven congregations. But at the council it soon became evident that the watch-er of secession, congregation at Breslau, March 9, 1845, with silence in this confession.

"Away from Rome," was about the only thing service, the doctrines of purgatory, transubstan-

made considerable changes in the Nicene Creed. 1845, and delegates were present from twenty-rouge as their astor, went much farther in their deviation from omanism, and had, for instance, made alterable changes in the Nicene Creed. A common council was held at Leipzig, Easter, 1845, and delegates were present from twenty-seven congregations. But at the council it soon became evident that the watch-er of secession, congregation at Breslau, March 9, 1845, with silence in this confession.

"Away from Rome," was about the only thing service, the doctrines of purgatory, transubstan-

made considerable changes in the Nicene Creed. 1845, and delegates were present from twenty-rouge as their astor, went much farther in their deviation from omanism, and had, for instance, made alterable changes in the Nicene Creed. A common council was held at Leipzig, Easter, 1845, and delegates were present from twenty-seven congregations. But at the council it soon became evident that the watch-er of secession, congregation at Breslau, March 9, 1845, with silence in this confession.

"Away from Rome," was about the only thing service, the doctrines of purgatory, transubstan-

made considerable changes in the Nicene Creed. 1845, and delegates were present from twenty-rouge as their astor, went much farther in their deviation from omanism, and had, for instance, made alterable changes in the Nicene Creed. A common council was held at Leipzig, Easter, 1845, and delegates were present from twenty-seven congregations. But at the council it soon became evident that the watch-er of secession, congregation at Breslau, March 9, 1845, with silence in this confession.

"Away from Rome," was about the only thing service, the doctrines of purgatory, transubstan-

made considerable changes in the Nicene Creed. 1845, and delegates were present from twenty-rouge as their astor, went much farther in their deviation from omanism, and had, for instance, made alterable changes in the Nicene Creed. A common council was held at Leipzig, Easter, 1845, and delegates were present from twenty-seven congregations. But at the council it soon became evident that the watch-er of secession, congregation at Breslau, March 9, 1845, with silence in this confession.

"Away from Rome," was about the only thing service, the doctrines of purgatory, transubstan-

made considerable changes in the Nicene Creed. 1845, and delegates were present from twenty-rouge as their astor, went much farther in their deviation from omanism, and had, for instance, made alterable changes in the Nicene Creed. A common council was held at Leipzig, Easter, 1845, and delegates were present from twenty-seven congregations. But at the council it soon became evident that the watch-er of secession, congregation at Breslau, March 9, 1845, with silence in this confession.

"Away from Rome," was about the only thing service, the doctrines of purgatory, transubstan-

made considerable changes in the Nicene Creed. 1845, and delegates were present from twenty-rouge as their astor, went much farther in their deviation from omanism, and had, for instance, made alterable changes in the Nicene Creed. A common council was held at Leipzig, Easter, 1845, and delegates were present from twenty-seven congregations. But at the council it soon became evident that the watch-er of secession, congregation at Breslau, March 9, 1845, with silence in this confession.

"Away from Rome," was about the only thing service, the doctrines of purgatory, transubstan-

made considerable changes in the Nicene Creed. 1845, and delegates were present from twenty-rouge as their astor, went much farther in their deviation from omanism, and had, for instance, made alterable changes in the Nicene Creed. A common council was held at Leipzig, Easter, 1845, and delegates were present from twenty-seven congregations. But at the council it soon became evident that the watch-er of secession, congregation at Breslau, March 9, 1845, with silence in this confession.
GERMAN TRANSLATIONS.

complete, "that is, books which are not of equal authority with the Holy Scriptures, but which it is useful and good to read," were first published in 1534. In subsequent editions Luther made many improvements in his version. The translation of the Psalms was much altered; so that he himself, in comparing the edition of 1531 with that of 1534, says the latter is nearer the Hebrew, the former the German. This is true of the whole.

Luther lived to see ten original editions of his Bible, and, in order to make the work as perfect as possible, formed a committee on translation (collegium biblicum), consisting of Melancthon, Bugenhagen, Jonas, Cruciger, Aurogallus, and Rorarius, which met in his rooms one evening every week, for consultation. With the edition of 1544, 1515, Luther's work of emending came to an end.

Luther's Bible had a very extensive circulation. Between 1522 and 1533 it is almost certain that there were sixteen original editions of the New Testament; and the reprints amounted to fifty-four (fourteen in Augsburg, thirteen in Strassburg, twelve in Basel, etc.). Luther complained of the reprints; and in the edition of 1530, opposite the titlepage, is a warning against them as "careless and faulty." "Unzweisig und falsch," and an appeal to others who wanted a German Testament "to make one of their own." Many changes were introduced into these reprints. The Old Testament was also frequently reprinted, the Pentateuch twenty-two times (seven in Wittenberg), the historical books nineteen times, and the prophetic books fourteen times. Single books were also reprinted. The Psalter went through seventeen editions. Before the completion of Luther's Bible, in 1534, editions had appeared with all the books,—four such in Zürich between 1523 and 1531, one in Worms 1530, two in Strassburg 1530, and one in Frankfurt 1534. These were made up of Luther's translation, so far as it went, and the missing books supplied by Haetzter (on the prophets), Leo Judeus (on the Apocrypha), and others. The four last of these editions also contained the Epistle to the Laodiceans in the old German translation.

Luther translated directly from the original, using for the Old Testament the edition of Brescia, 1494, and for the New Testament the Erasmus text of the edition of 1519. Although he was not the best philological scholar of his day, he was sufficient of a scholar to be independent; and what he lacked in philological penetration he made up by his accurate exegetical intuition, and by his spiritual understanding of the Bible. There are mistakes, especially in the harder passages of Job and the Prophets; but as a whole his translations are accurate. In the Apocrypha he was not so careful, and translated from the Vulgate as far as the German itself was concerned, Luther was eminently fitted for his task. He was a German through and through, and possessed to a remarkable degree the gift of strong and pithy speech. He avoided being a "literalist" (Buchstabilität), and sought to "give the pure and clear German." His danger was that his own race; but his reverence for the letter of Scripture kept him from serious errors in this direction. Yet he does not at times shrink from adding to the text where he thinks the truth demands emphasis, as in Rom. iii. 28, where he adds alone, "A man is justified by faith alone" (allein durch den Glauben). The language is clear, vivid and forcible, rich and melodious, noble and chaste. Often he sought diligently for the proper word. "We," he says, "that is, Melancthon, Aurogallus, and I, are working on Job, but so that sometimes we have been hardly able to finish three lines in four days."

Not only did Luther's Bible have an immense influence in extending the Reformation. It was a national work, and fixed the German language, making High-German the common dialect. Within a hundred years, through its influence, it had come into general use in the churches and schools, and Low-German had degenerated into the patois. But there were not wanting violent attacks upon it. One of his critics, Emser, in his "Auss war grund und urachs Luther's dolmatschung dem gemeinen man billich verboten worden sey, Leipzig, 1529 ("For what cause and reason Luther's translation has been properly forbidden to the common people"), pronounced it to be full of heretical errors and lies. Wicelius (Annotationes, Leipzig, 1536) followed substantially in the same line, and the Roman Catholics (Traub 1578, Zanger 1805, etc.) Luther and his friends took little notice of these criticisms.

Luther's translation has never been regarded by the Lutheran Church as unsuitable of improvement. Its need of revision cannot be questioned; but any revision must be accomplished in the spirit of Luther. Private revisions have been made by J. F. v. Meyer (3d ed., Frankfurt, 1833, revised by Stier, Bielef., 3d ed., 1867), Kraus (Tübingen, 1830), and Hopf (3d ed., Leipzig, 1854). The variations in the text of Luther finally led to a movement towards revision. It started at the meetings of the church diet at Stuttgart 1857, and Hamburg 1858; and in 1863 the meeting at Eisenach, at the advice of the church council (Oberkirchenrat) of Berlin, appointed a revision commission. They performed their labors, but did not attempt a thorough revision. The New Testament appeared at Halle, 1867, and the whole Bible, 1883.

The Roman Catholics could not remain idle spectators of the wonderful success of Luther's Bible. Beringer put forth an edition of Luther, with only a few changes (Speier, 1526), but was followed by Hieronymus Emser, "the scribbler of Dresden" (d. Sudler in Dresen), with a more extensively emended text (Dresden, 1827). It was often reprinted. Johann Eck also put forth a Bible (Ingolstadt, 1537), but it proved a failure. The New Testament was taken from Emser, and the Old Testament was a reprint of the pre-Luther version. Eck's German is beneath criticism. In 1534 appeared at Mainz the Bible of the Dominican Dr. Dietenberger, which is also not an original translation. It was afterwards revised by Ulenberg (Cologne, 1630) and the theologians of Mainz (Cologne, 1662), and has since, under the title Catholic Bible, been used by the German Catholics.

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries new translations or revisions were attempted. Of these the best was the Berleburg Bible (1726-42). One of the best translations is that of De
GERMANY.

Wette (Heidelberg, 1800-14, 4th ed., 1838), who for a time had the co-operation of Augusti. He combined extraordinary aids of brief and pungent expression with exegetical tact. Of the translations of parts of the Old Testament, the Prophetic Books of Ewald (Stuttgart, 1840) and Hitzig (Leipzig, 1854), and the Poetical Books of Ewald (Göttingen, 1855) and E. Meier (Stuttgart, 1854), deserve special mention. Of the New Testament many translations have appeared. Some of those of the theological school of the last century are curiosities; for example, that of Bahrdt (Riga, 1773), who renders Matt. v. 4, “Blessed are they who prefer the sweet sorrows (d. süßen Meinungskreisen) of virtue to the intoxicating pleasures of vice; for they shall be abundantly comforted.” Among the best of the translations of this century is that of Weizsäcker (Tübingen, 1875).


GERMANY, meaning the German Empire (constituted in 1871, after the brilliant victory over France), comprises an area of 280,000 square miles, with 42,727,360 inhabitants (according to the census of 1875), of whom 26,718,623 are Protestants, 15,371,257 Roman Catholics, 520,575 Jews, 100,908 Dissenters, and 16,127 of no religion stated. Thus about two-thirds (a little less) of the population of Germany are Protestant, and one-third (a little more) Roman Catholic; and the relation between the two denominations was nearly the same two centuries ago, at the end of the Thirty-Years' War, in 1648. The Protestants have increased a little faster than the Roman Catholics; not on account of conversions, however, but because the population increases at a somewhat higher rate in the Protestant regions.

The location of the two denominations is also nearly the same now as two centuries ago. In South Germany the Roman Church prevails; in Northern, the Evangelical. Bavaria, Baden, and Alsace-Lorraine are predominantly Roman Catholic; Schleswig-Holstein, Mecklenburg, Hanover, Brandenburg, and Saxony are almost wholly Protestant.

In the Protestant Church attempts have been made to unite the Reformed and the Lutheran; and such a union was actually established in Prussia and Nassau 1817, in the Palatinate 1818, and in Baden 1822. Nevertheless, when, in 1860, Prussia annexed Hanover and Schleswig-Holstein, whose inhabitants are Lutheran, and Hesse, whose inhabitants are Reformed, the union was not introduced in those countries. The government of the Evangelical State Church of Prussia is consistorial; at the head of the whole church stands an ecclesiastical council (Oberkirchenrat), of each province a superintendent-general with a consistorial board, of each diocese a superintendent, of each parish a minister.

The Roman Church has six archbishoprics,—Breslau, Gnesen-Posen, Cologne, Freiburg, Münch-Freising, and Bamberg; and eighteen bishoprics, Ermland, Kulm, Pulda, Hildesheim, Osnabrück, Paderborn, Mülnster, Limburg, Trevés, Metz, Strassburg, Spire, Würzburg, Ratisbon, Passau, Eichstätt, Augsburg, and Rotterdam. An apostolic vicar resides in Dresden. The Jesuits were expelled in 1784. After the promulgation of the dogma of papal infallibility in 1871, the secession of the Old Catholics (see art.) took place. In 1878 they numbered about fifty-two thousand, divided into a hundred and twenty-two congregations. See BÜHLER, Der Altkatholizismus, Leiden, 1880, p. 49.

For further statistical details, and for the history of the Church in Germany, see the articles on the separate states (Bavaria, etc.), on the ancient tribes (Alemanni, Saxons, etc.), on the special periods, places, and sects (the Reformation, Cologne, Anabaptists, etc.) and, finally, biographies.

The German Empire is, like the government of the United States, a purely political union of the different German states, and has, as such, nothing to do with religion, which is left to the several states. But the emperor of Germany, who is at the same time king of Prussia, is at the head of the Evangelical Church of Prussia.

GERSON, Jean Charlier, a distinguished theologian, and one of the founders of Gallicanism, known as the Doctor Christianissimus (“Most Christian Doctor”); b. in the village of Gerson, in the diocese of Rheims, Dec. 14, 1669; d. at Lyons, July 12, 1429. His parents were peasants; his mother, according to his own statement, a “second Monica.” In 1877 he entered the College of Navarre, Paris, and began, five years later, the study of theology, under Pope D’Ailly and Gilles des Champs. By 1887 he had attained so considerable a reputation as to be chosen by the university representatives to plead before Pope Clement VII, for a sentence against the Dominican, John of Montes, who denied the immaculate conception of the Virgin. In 1892 he succeeded D’Ailly as chancellor of the University of Paris, then in the zenith of its fame. As a theologian, Gerson
revolted against scholasticism, and in his many theological tracts uttered his voice against its untenable and useless subtleties. In his De Ref. Theol. ("The Reformation of Theology," 1400) he urged the study of the Bible and the Fathers. A nominalist in philosophy, he adopted a mystical type of theology. It was, however, not the Gerson of the fourteenth century, which sought to lose the identity of the individual by a bold flight of the intellect in the Deity, and revelled in fanciful religious emotions. Following Hugo and Richard de St. Victor, he turned the gaze of the soul inward upon its own states, and sought in this way to derive a theory of its laws. He constructed a system consisting of two parts. — De Myst. Theol. Spec. ("Speculative Mysticism") and De Myst. Theol. Pract. ("Practical Mysticism"). The former is devoted principally to the discussion of questions in psychology, under the heads of vis cognitiva ("the intellect") and affectiva ("will and emotions"). Mystical theology is defined to be a theology of love. Love is the experimental apprehension of God (Experiment. Dei percepito), and through the instrumentality of love the will becomes submissive to God's will, and lost in it. Among his many treatises on the mystical life, perhaps the most important is the De Monte Contemplat. ("The Mount of Contemplation").

But Gerson's main activity was his attempt to bring order and peace out of the ecclesiastical confusion of his day, and to define the relation of the Church to the Pope. In this latter regard he is the founder of Gallicanism, and the forerunner of Bossuet. The papal schism at one time seemed to be so hopeless, that he retired from the office of chancellor and public life, and was only induced to return to Paris after five years of seclusion, about the time of the flight of Pope Benedict XIII. (1403). Gerson again devoted himself, by tracts and personal addresses before Benedict, to the task of healing the schism, and securing his submission to the laws of the Church. To his other labors he added those of defending the Church and the Pope, from the attacks of heretics. Gerson's interest in the schism is evidenced in his De Auferibilis Papa ab Ecclesia, written during the sessions, after re-asserting the authority of councils, he claims, that in matters of doctrine, as well as in other matters, appeal could be made to it, as the Pope was not infallible. A stain rests upon Gerson's record in the part he took in the condemnation of John Hus at this council. He was an active prosecutor, and presented the nineteen heretical propositions extracted from Hus's work. After the adjournment, he was precluded from returning to France by the bitter hostility of the Duke of Burgundy, and took refuge in Bavaria. He still continued active in authorship, and was called to the newly founded university in Vienna, but declined to go. At the death of the Duke of Burgundy (1419) he returned to his native land, and spent the last ten years of his life in Lyons. A gray-haired man, he devoted himself to the instruction of children, and, as his end approached, gathered them about him once again, that he might pray with them.


Gertrude is the name of several saintly women known to medieval church-history, of which the most noticeable are, — St. Gertrude, also called "The Great Gertrude"; — b. at Eisleben, Jan. 6, 1256. She entered the monastery of Helfta when she was only five years old, and studied the liberal arts with great eagerness. But Jan. 21, 1281, she had a vision which led her to the study of the Bible and the Fathers. She had afterwards many more visions, of which a kind of report has been given in the Inquisitiones divinae Pietatis, first printed in 1540, but now reprinted. — St. Gertrudis, a daughter of Pippin of Landen (major domus to Clothaire II.) and Itta. After the death of Pippin, in 839, Itta built a large double monastery for male and female recluses at Niviala, the present Nivelle, and made her daughter abbess of it. St. Gertrudis died in 850 or 854, and is still honored in Flanders as the patroness of cats, travellers, and pilgrims. She is represented with rats and mice at her feet, or running up her pastoral staff, or on her dress. See Act. Sanct., March 17.

Gervaie, Francois Armand, b. at Paris, 1899; d. there 1751; entered the order of the Barefooted Carmelites, but left them, not finding their rules severe enough, and joined the Trappists in 1695. In the following year he was made Abbot of La Trappe, but resigned in 1698. He was a prolific writer. Of his works the most noticeable is the Histoire genealogique de l'orde de Citeaux en France, Avignon, 1748, which is a sharp attack on the Benedictines, and was much resented by them.

Gervasio and Protasius, two brethren who were martyred at Ravenna during the reign.
of Nero, and then entirely forgotten until a vision revealed to St. Ambrose the whereabouts of their remains. This vision and the miracles which the relics immediately performed were used as proofs of orthodoxy by St. Ambrose in his contest with the Arians; but the latter had good reason to doubt, and instituted a line of criticism, which, in spite of the emphatic assertions of St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, has found its followers down to our times. See Mosheim, Gibbon, Isaac Taylor (Ancient Christianity), and others. The fanciful legends of the two martyrs are found Act. Somct., June 19.

GESENIUS, Justus, a Lutheran theologian; b. July 6, 1601, at Essbach; d. at Hanover, Sept. 18, 1673. He was court-preacher at Hanover. In 1648 (or 1647) he edited a hymn-book with Denicke, and was the first to change the text of German hymns. (See above.) He was the author of some hymns, one of which (Wenn meine Sünd'n mich kränken) is popular in Germany.

GESENIUS, Wilhelm, a celebrated Hebrew scholar; b. in Nordhausen, Feb. 3, 1785; d. at Halle, Oct. 23, 1842. He was educated at Helmstedt and Göttingen, where he received in Eichhorn's class-room the impulse to critical and philological studies. His public life began as document at Göttingen, and in subsequent years he took pleasure in relating that Neander had been his first student in Hebrew. In 1810 he was called to Halle, where he continued during the remainder of his life, in spite of an invitation to become Eichhorn's successor at Göttingen. His lectures were very popular, more than four hundred students at one period crowding to hear him. He made two visits to England (1820, 1835) in the interest of his Oriental studies.

Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon appeared in two volumes (1810-12). His Hebrew Thesaurus (3 vols.) began to be printed 1826, but was not finished till after his death, under the editorship of his pupil Rödiger. This great work is indeed a storehouse full of the various materials in the department of the Hebrew of the Old Testament; but it is to be regretted, that, with his thorough Semitic erudition, he did not include the forms of post-biblical Hebrew. His Grammar appeared in 1813, his Gesch. d. heb. Sprache u. Schrift, 1815, and his Lehrgedichte d. heb. Sprache, 1817. These grammatical labors did not meet with the same general favor as the lexicographical. This was due both to the appearance of other works in this special line, and to the fact that the author did not pursue a strict and philosophical method in his treatment. In 1821 his Commentary on Isaiah appeared in three volumes. This was just at the close of the period during which the rationalistic mode of exposition had absolute sway. The work deserves to be regarded as one of the best products of that school, being distinguished for philological thoroughness, lucid presentation, and acquaintance with historical criticism, as well as for freedom from dogmatic and apologetic prepossessions. Gesenius belonged to the rationalistic school, but was no partisan. The philological element preponderates in his works. When rationalism began to wane at Halle, he was regarded, on account of his personal influence over the students and the fame of his scholarship, its chief representative. He was one of the principal persons aimed at in the attack against rationalistic teachers, which started in Berlin in 1830. But he held his position, and the complaints ceased. In addition to the works mentioned above, he published Versuch d. m. m. Sprach. (1810), De Pentateuchi Samarit. Origine, etc. (1815), De Samaritan. Theol. (1822), Carmina Samaritan. (1824), an Edition of Burchardus' Travels (1823), Monumenta Phoenica (1837). Gesenius also made large contributions to Erich and Gruber's Encyclopädie and to the Hallische Literaturzeitung. For a well-prepared sketch of his life, see Gesenius: Eine Erinnerung für seine Freunde (by Haym), Berlin, 1842.
tion, and, though he did not actually embrace Romanism until 1838, he was long before that time considered one of the leaders of ultramontane theology. To the latter part of his life belong his *Geschichte der Karolinger*, Freiburg, 1848, 2 vols.; *Papst Gregorius und sein Zeitalter*, Schaffhausen, 1859–61, 7 vols., etc.

**GIBBON.**

**GIANTS.** Like all nations of antiquity, the Hebrews had also their stories about giants. The word "giants" has different representations in the Hebrew. Thus (Gen. vi. 4) they are called the *Nephilim* (Gen. xxvi. 5) and the *Rephaim*. Of his race was Og, King of Bashan, whose "bedstead was nine cubits in length and four cubits in breadth, according to the cubit of a man" (Deut. iii. 11). (3) The *Anakim* (Num. xiii. 28, 32, 33; Deut. ii. 10). They were destroyed by Joshua (Josh. xii. 22; Judg. i. 20). Another race of giants (4), the *Emim*, is mentioned in Deut. ii. 10, who dwelt in the country of the Moabites. Another race, known (5) as the *Zammumim*, is described Deut. ii. 20, 21. In Job xvi. 14 the authorized version reads, "like a giant;" but the Hebrew word here used is elsewhere translated "a mighty man;" i.e., champion or hero. Comp. the art. *Riesen*, in *Henze's Real-Encyclopaedia*.

**GIBBON, Edward,** the author of *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*; b. at Putney, Surrey, April 27, 1737; d. in London, Jan. 16, 1794. His early education was often interrupted by ill health. He entered Oxford University, 1752, but was expelled, after fourteen months, because of his (temporary) conversion to Roman Catholicism (June 8, 1753), due to reading Bossuet's *Variations of Protestantism*, when his mind had been unsettled by Middleton's *Receuil*. Gibbon was sent by his father to live with a Calvinistic minister (M. Pavilliard) at Lausanne, Switzerland. There he remained five years in diligent study, and became remarkably intimate with the classic Latin authors, and also acquired such familiarity with French, that, when he began to write his History, he seriously contemplated whether he should write it in that language. Two events occurred during this period which affected his whole life, — his renunciation of Romanism (1754) without being reconverted to Protestantism, and his love for Mlle. Susanne Curchod (1757), who afterwards married Jacques Necker (1764), the famous financier. The result of his change of religion seems to have been indifference to all religion; the result of his disappointment in love, his resolution never to marry. He returned home in 1758, obedient to his father's summons, and for many years led an aimless, though scholarly and laborious life. An episode had an important bearing upon his career. For two years (1760–62) he was a militia captain; and this experience gave him not only robust health, but a knowledge of military matters which enabled him in great measure when he came to write his History. It was in Rome (Oct. 15, 1764), while sitting amidst the ruins of the Capitol, that the idea of writing the decline and fall of the city first started in his mind; but he did not really begin his immortal work until 1772. In February, 1773, he began; on the night of June 27, 1787, he wrote in his garden at Lausanne, whither he had removed in 1783, the last words of his History; and the last volume appeared April 27, 1788. The original edition was in six quarto volumes. Its sale was remarkable, indeed unprecedented. The remainder of the historian's life was brief. He had nothing to live for, now that his life-work was done. The loss of intimate friends, and a physical malady, saddened the close of his days.

Of his History it is superfluous to speak. It has been put in the first rank by universal suffrage. The historians of every land unite in its praise. Later researches have confirmed its judgments, and corrected but few statements. It probably never will be antiquated. Its period extends from the middle of the second century to 1453. The only charge which has been successfully brought against it is that it betrays an unfriendly animus to Christianity. He had so little sympathy with the aims of the Church, that it was not to be expected that he would throw the mantle of charity over the foibles and failings of churchmen. In regard to the famous fifteenth and sixteenth chapters, which relate to the rise and spread of Christianity, wherein its success is explained by reference to secondary causes, and the severity of its early trials declared to have been over-estimated, it may be remarked, that Gibbon himself admitted that his array of secondary causes left the question of the divine origin of Christianity unattempted; and, now that the smoke of the battle against this portion of the History has cleared away, church historians allow the substantial justness of his main positions. It was, of course, not Gibbon's intention to write a church history; but, in spite of himself, he has traversed the ground, and also, however unwilling he might be, it remains true, that, "in tracing the gradual decline and fall of imperial Rome, he has involuntarily become a witness to the gradual growth and triumph of the religion of the cross." See SCHAFF: *Church History,*, 2 vols. (again 1872), 8 vols. (revised ed.).

The best edition of *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* is that published by Murray of London, 1854 (again 1872), 8 vols. (reprinted by Harper and Brothers, New York, 1880, 6 vols.), edited by Dr. William Smith, who has incorporated the notes of Guizot, Weneck, and Milman. His *Miscellaneous Works*, with *Memoirs of his Life and Writings*, composed by himself, illustrated from his *Letters*, with occasional Notes and Narrative, appeared in new ed., 1837. His *Autobiography*, one of the best ever written, is prefixed to the editions of his History and Miscellaneous mentioned above, and also published separately in the *Choice Autobiographies*, ed. by W. D. Howells, Boston, 1878.

**GIBERTI, Giovanni Matteo,** b. at Palermo, 1495; d. at Verona, 1543; was made bishop of the latter place in 1524. He was one of those Italian prelates, who, before the Council of Trent, showed a serious interest for the reform of the church, drawing his inspiration from Erasmus, and exercising considerable influence on Carlo Borromeo. His works (*Constitutiones Giber- tine, Monitiones generales, Edicta selecta*, etc.) were edited by Pietro Ballerini, who also wrote his life (*Verona, 1739*).

**GIBSON, Edmund, D.D.,** b. at Bampton, in Oxfordshire, 1715; d. at Bath, Sept. 6, 1748; was consecrated Bishop of Lincoln 1715, and of...
GIOHTEL, Johann Georg, b. at Regensburg, May 14, 1638; d. at Amsterdam, Jan. 21, 1710: studied law at Strassburg; settled at Spires, and May 14, 1638; d. at Amsterdam, Jan. 21, 1710; refused the title of king, but instituted a special of Gideon's official activity, little is recorded. He his people. He struck at idolatry by destroying or the statutes, constitution, canons, rubrics, and articles of the Church of England (1718, reprinted at Oxford, 1781, 2 vols. folio), consisting of writings on the subject by eminent English divines during James II.'s reign. Dr. John Cumming edited a revised edition, London, 1848-49, 18 vols., with supplement, 1849, 8 vols.

GICHTEL, Johann Georg, b. at Regensburg, May 14, 1638; d. at Amsterdam, Jan. 21, 1710: studied law at Strassburg; settled at Spires, and began a brilliant career as an advocate, but was by his acquaintance, J. E. von Weltz, led astray into a mist of fantastic mysticism and ascetic theosophy, from which he never escaped. Ex pelitions on his unbelief, in account of an open letter to the preachers of Nuremberg and Regensburg, he spent most of his time at Zwoll with Friedrich Breckling, and in Amsterdam with Antoinette Bourignon and the Labadists. His writings have been collected in seven volumes, under the title of Theosophia practica.

GIDEON (גִּדֵּהוֹן, heber), one of the more illustrious judges of Israel and of the tribe of Manasseh. His history is recorded in the sixth to the eighth chapters of Judges. The occasion of his public appearance as judge was the severity of the Midianite oppression, which lasted seven years. He received a divine call under the treathin of Ephraim, and built an altar there in commemoration of God's recollection of his people. He struck at idolatry by destroying the altar of Baal, for which he received the title of Jerubbaal, "Let Baal plead," etc. (vi. 32). His great achievement was the defeat of the Midianites, who had encamped in large numbers on the plain of Jezreel. The tribes of Manasseh, Asher, Zebulon, and Naphtali acknowledged him as leader. But Gideon first demanded a sign, his warriors being the first to offer him a sacrifice. He won a victory over the Midianites, who were thereby driven into an idolatrous worship (perhaps of the Urim and Thummim on the ephod). Gideon's heroism was long remembered after his death (Ps. cxlviii. 9, 10; Isa. ix. 4, 26; Heb. xi. 32). [See the Commentaries on Judges, and Canon Farrar's article in Smith's Bible Dict.]

GIESERL, Johann Karl Ludwig, b. at Petershagen, near Minden, March 3, 1788; d. at Göttingen, July 8, 1854. He studied at Halle, fought in the corps of liberation 1813, and was appointed director of the gymnasium of Göttingen 1815, professor of theology at Bonn 1819, and at Göttingen 1831. His principal work is his Church-History, in its kind one of the most remarkable productions of German learning, distinguished by its immense erudition, accuracy, and careful selection of passages from the sources which constitute the body of the work in the form of footnotes, while the text is a meagre skeleton down to 1848. First volume appeared 1824; fifth and last (containing his lectures, and treating the period from 1814 to the present time) 1855, after his death. No less than three English translations have been published of this work,—one after the earlier editions, by Cunningham (Philadelphia, 1836, 3 vols.); and two after the latest edition, by Davidson (Edinburgh, 1848-56, 5 vols.), and by H. B. Smith (New York, 1857-91, 5 vols.), completed by Miss Mary Robinson. Among his other productions are, Dogmengeschichte (posthumous, 1855), Versuch über die Entdeckung der schriftlichen Evangelien (his first book, 1818, and a death-blow to the theory of one primal gospel, Urevangelium); Unruhen in d. niederrlad.-ref. Kirche (1840); Ueber die Lehr- und polemische Weisung (1840), etc. Redepenning wrote a Life of him in the last volume of the Church-History.

GIFTS, Spiritual (Charismata). The old Protestant theologians understood by this term the endowment to perform miraculous works,—such as the speaking with tongues, healing the sick, raising the dead,—and limited it to the primitive Church. This is still the view of the Protestant Church, which regards these gifts either as forfeited by the Church's guilt (Irvingism), or extinguished by God as no longer necessary. The Catholic Church regards the miracles of the saints as the result of the continuance of the same endowments of the Holy Spirit, and not merely the characteristic faculties of the individual as they appear in various forms of activity subsequent to conversion, as Baur would have it.

Nothing definite as to the nature of the charisma is to be drawn from the etymology. The term outside of the Pauline Epistles is only used twice,—once by Philo (De Alleg. ii. 75), and once by Peter (1 Pet. iv. 10). It gets from charis (grace) the special meaning of a gracious gift in two cases, the pardon of sin (Rom. v. 15), and eternal life (Rom. vi. 23), or of the other works are divine grace in general (Rom. xi. 29). In all other cases the word signifies special gracious endowments of the Holy Spirit which exist in the believer as evidences and proofs of the experience of divine grace (1 Tim. iv. 14, etc.), and in such a way that the national place of worship was in the proud tribe of Ephraim. Gideon made an ephod, which he probably wore himself as priest. It proved a snare to his tribe and people, who were led thereby into an idolatrous worship (perhaps of the Urim and Thummim on the ephod). Gideon's heroism was long remembered after his death (Ps. cxlviii. 9, 10; Isa. ix. 4, 26; Heb. xi. 32). [See the Commentaries on Judges, and Canon Farrar's article in Smith's Bible Dict.]

OXHILER.
characteristic of the state of grace. Neander is right when he defines the charisma as a capacity in which the power and activity of the indwelling Spirit are revealed, be this capacity immediately imparted by the Spirit, or merely a natural capacity sanctified and enlarged by the principle of the new life. The comprehensive definition, then, would be as follows: charismata are capacities and aptitudes necessary for the edification of the Church, and produced by the Holy Spirit, in consequence of which individuals are enabled to use their natural endowments in the service of the Church, and are furnished with new powers to effect this end.

The charismata are the necessary preparation for the administration of offices in the Church; and Christians may themselves become charismata (1 Cor. xii. 28). Church offices are not something distinct from them (1 Cor. xii. 5), as Thiéresch and others hold, but impossible without charismatic endowment. The question then arises, To what extent are the charismata permanent in the Church? Their number is as various as the needs of the church; and neither the enumeration of 1 Cor. xii., nor of Eph. iv., nor Rom. xii. can be regarded as exhaustive. But those are permanent which are necessary for the government of the Church, and those temporary which had a miraculous element, as the miraculous gifts of the apostles. But among the latter is not to be included the "gift of proclaiming the gospel so as to produce faith" (Weiss). The apostolic charismata bear the same relation to those of the ministry, that the apostolic office does to the pastoral office, and consist in the power to lay the foundations of the Church. They are therefore no circumstances calling for their repetition. (The fullest list of the charismata, or spiritual gifts, is given in 1 Cor. xii.,—speaking with tongues, working miracles, gifts of healing, knowledge, etc.). See David Schultz: D. Geistesgaben d. ersten Christen; Bohlen: V. d. Charismen im Allgemeinen, etc., Regensb., 1818; The Histories of the Ap. Ch., by Trautmann, Leip., 1848 [Neander und Schaff]. CREMER.

GIFTTHEIL, Ludwig Friedrich, son of an abbot in Württemberg, and noted for his fanatical declamations against the State Church. The date of his birth is not known; but his literary activity connected with Brecklin and other persons of the same description, published letters of warning to the king of England (1643-44) and to Cromwell, whom he styled "field-marshal of the devil, street-robber, thief, and murderer," and wrote in 1647 Declaration aus Orient, etc. See Böhme: Acht Bücher von der Reformation der Kirche in England, Altona, 1734. HAGENBACH.

GILBERT OF SEMPRINGHAM, founder of the order of the Gilbertines, or Sempinghan canons (Ordo Gilbertinorum Canonico-rum, or Ordo Sempinghanensis); b. about 1083, at Sempinghan, Lincolnshire, of a Norman noble family; d. there Feb. 4, 1180. He was ordained a priest and pastor of Sempinghan-Tirington, in 1123; in 1135 he built a convent for the shelter of seven destitute girls, and shortly after was called upon to establish others for numerous other poor and destitute girls. To the nun's he gave the Benedictine rule. In 1148 he was refused permission by Pope Eugenius III. to merge all these monasteries in the Cistercian order, and therefore they were per force independent. At the time of his death the order possessed eighteen hundred members (seven hundred males, eleven hundred females), thirteen double monasteries with hospitals, almshouses, and orphanages attached: when suppressed by Henry VIII., it possessed twenty-five monasteries. In the Hollandist Acta Sanctorum, Feb. 4, Gilbert appears as the author of the Gilbertinorum Statute and Exhortationes ad Fratre. He was canonized by Innocent III. 1202, and is commemorated Feb. 4. See Hürter: Gesch. des Innocenz III. u. seiner Zeitgenossen, Gotha, 1834-42, 4 vols. ZÖCKLER.

GILBOA (bubbling fountain), a mountain-range east of the plain of Jezreel, the present Jebel Fau'a, bleak and bare, 1,717 feet high, and for the most part very steep, running east-south-east for about ten miles; was the place where Saul and his three sons were slain in battle against the Philistines the day after his visit to the witch of Endor (1 Sam. xxviii. 4; 1 Chron. x. 1; 2 Sam. i. 21).

GILDAS, the oldest and the only extant of the historians of the ancient Britons; wrote a Historia and an Epistola, in which he gives a record of the British history under the Romans, and from their withdrawal to his own time. Though these works have been quoted by Bede, Alcuin, William of Newbury, Geoffrey of Monmouth, and Giraldus Cambrensis, no reliable biographical notice of the author exists. The legends from the later middle ages are mere fiction. It seems, however, that he was born in Gild, became a monk in the monastery of Bangor, and died 570. The best known of his works is that by Stevenson, London, 1888. Translations have been made by Habington, London, 1638, and by Giles, London, 1841, republished, with additions, in Bohn's Six Old English Chronicles.

GILEAD. See TRIBES OF ISRAEL.

GILES, St. (the same as the Greek Alypion; Latin, Egidius; Italian, Egidio). Spanish, Gil; and
French, Gille\n
GILLFILLAN, George, a popular writer of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland; b. at Comrie, Perthshire, Scotland, Jan. 30, 1813; d. Aug. 13, 1878. After study at Glasgow University, he was ordained pastor of a Secession congregation at Dundee, in March, 1838. Beginning with Five Discourses (1839), he issued many volumes of popular literary criticism, which have had a large circulation. His best work is Bard's of the Bible (1851, 8th ed., 1874), which attempts to be "a poem on the Bible," with, however, questionable success; for he indulges too much in rhapsody, and lowers, while attempting to revivify, the heroes of the past. His life was laborious, spiritual, and useful. As a preacher and lecturer he was successful, not alone in attracting numbers, but in making a profound impression by his thrilling eloquence.

GILFILLAN, John, D.D., a learned Baptist divine and biblical expositor; b. Nov. 23, 1697, at Kettering, Northamptonshire, where his father preached to the mixed congregation of Dissenters; d. Oct. 14, 1771, at Camberrwell. His school education was limited; but by private study he acquired much knowledge, and is said to have learned Hebrew without any assistance. After preaching for a time in Higham Ferrers, he was called in 1720 to the Baptist church at Horseydown, near London. Dr. Gill was a profound theologian and a voluminous author. He was one of the leading advocates of his day of Hyper-Calvinism, but a vigorous opponent of infant-baptism (against Jonathan Dickinson and others). He published one of the ablest answers to Whitby's Five Points, under the title The Cause of God and Truth (4 vols., 1735-38). The same views are stated in his Body of Divinity, 2 vols., 1708 (new ed., Lond., 1829), to which he added a volume on Practical Divinity (1770). Like Dr. Dwight's Theology, it contained the substance of sermons preached from the pulpit. Of his advocacy of Calvinism, Toplady said, "Certainly no man has treated that momentous subject, the system of divine grace, in all its branches more closely, judiciously, and successfully." Dr. Gill's great work was his Exposition of the New Testament (1748-49, in 3 vols.) and of the Old Testament (1783-76, in 6 vols.). His first effort in this department was an Exposition of Solomon's Song, which he preached from the pulpit in 1724, and published in 1728. This commentary is enriched with the stores of rabbinical learning. Mr. Spurgeon calls it "in valuable in its own line of things." It is still useful for homiletic purposes, but pursues the allegorizing method to an extreme. The best edition of Gill's commentary is in 9 vols., Phila., 1811-19, with a full Memoir. Kirwan: Brief Memoir of the Life and Writings of J. G. GILLIESPIE, George, one of the four Scotch commissioners to the Westminster Assembly of Divines; was the son of a clergyman; b. at Kirkcaldy, Jan. 21, 1613; d. at Kirkcaldy, Dec. 17, 1648. He studied at St. Andrew's, and in 1638 was ordained pastor at Wemyss, whence in 1642 he was translated to Edinburgh. In 1643 he was chosen a member of the Westminster Assembly. He was the youngest member of that body, but proved himself to be one of its closest reasoners, and one of its readiest and most able debaters. He was always listened to with attention, and opposed at times, with success, even the great learning of Lightfoot and Selden. The story is told, that when the Assembly came to the question in the Shorter Catechism, "What is God?" all declined to give a definition except Gillespie, who was hit upon as being the youngest member. He reluctantly consented, but called upon the body to unite with him in prayer before attempting it. His very first words of invocation were taken down, and incorporated as the best possible human answer. In 1648 he was moderator of the General Assembly of Scotland. His brilliant and meteoric career was cut short at the early age of thirty-five. In 1637 he put forth The English Popish Ceremonies obtruded upon the Church of Scotland (a work which attracted much attention), and in 1641 Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland (in which he brings keenness of argument and able work against the "Independent Scheme"). His ablest work, Aaron's Rod blossoming, or the Divine Ordinance of Church-Government vindicated (pp. 500), appeared in London 1646, and was directed against Erastianism. The best edition of these and Gillespie's other works is by London, 1838.

GILLESPIE, Thomas, b. in the parish of Dudmington, Middlelothian, Scotland, in 1708; d. at Dunfermline, Jan. 19, 1774. In connection with Boston of Jedburgh, and Collier of Collinburn, he organized in 1751 the so-called "Presbytery of Relief" (i.e., "from the yoke of patronage and the tyranny of the church courts"), because, having been deposed for contumacy in refusing conscientiously to attend presbytery meetings called to ordain an unacceptable minister, his persistent efforts to be re-admitted were rejected. See Lives of the Fathers of the United Presbyterian Church, Edinburgh, 1849.

GILLET, Ezra Hall, D.D., a distinguished American Presbyterian divine and historian; b. at Colchester, Conn., July 15, 1823; d. in New-
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York City, Sept. 2, 1875. After graduating at Yale College (1841) and Union Theological Seminary (1844), he became pastor of a Presbyterian church in Harlem (1846), which he left in 1856 to become professor of political economy, ethics, and history in the University of New York. Dr. Gillett was a man of great humility, and remarkable for his painstaking, patient research as an historian. His first large work was _The Life and Times of John Huss_ (Boston, 1891, 2 vols., 6th ed., 1870), _His Hist. of the Presbyterian Ch. in the United States of America_ (Phil., 1884, 2 vols., rev. ed., 1873), which he was selected by the New School branch of the Presbyterian Church to prepare, is the most comprehensive work on the subject. _God in Human Thought_ ('2vols.) and the _Moral System_ (New York, 1876), for the use of students, grew out of an attempt to prepare a historical and critical Introduction to Butler's _Analogy_, and are especially valuable for their treatment of English thought in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Dr. Gillett was also a frequent contributor to _The Presbyterian Quarterly Review_ and _The St. Andrews Review_.

GILPIN, Bernard (Apostle of the North), b. at Kentmere, Eng., 1517; d. at Houghton-le-Spring, to which he had been appointed about 1556, March 4, 1588. He was a fearless preacher against the clerical and lay vices of the times, and a practical philanthropist. "His life was a ceaseless round of benevolent activity. Strangers and travellers found a ready reception; and even their horses were treated with so much care that it was humorously said, that, if one were turned loose in any part of the country, it would immediately make its way to the rector of Houghton. He built and endowed a grammar-school at a cost of upwards of five hundred pounds, educated and maintained a large number of poor children at his own charge, and provided the more promising pupils with means of studying at the universities. Among his parishioners he was looked up to as a judge, and was a service in preventing lawsuits among them." See _William Gilpin: Life of Bernard Gilpin_, with Introduction by Edward Irving, Glasgow, 1824.

GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS (Giraldo Barri), b. at Meanor Pyrr about 1147; d. about 1229; studied theology and canon law in Paris, and was, after his return in 1172, sent by the Archbishop of Canterbury to St. David, to reform the Church of the diocese, and bring it into harmony with the Roman Church, by the introduction of celibacy, tithes, etc. It was the policy of the English crown at that moment to build up a support for itself in Wales and Ireland by establishing the Roman hierarchy there; and Giraldu's attempt in St. David was a brilliant success. Nevertheless, when in 1176 he was elected bishop of that diocese by the chapter, he failed to obtain the royal recognition, and went to Paris, where he lectured on canon law. In 1180 he returned to Wales, and was for several years administrator of St. David during the absence of the bishop. He once more gained the favor of the king, and accompanied Prince John on his campaign in Ireland 1185, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, when, in 1186, he went to Wales to preach a crusade. Nevertheless, in 1188, he was elected Bishop of St. David, a position he again missed the goal by the opposition of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The rest of his life he spent in retirement. He was a very prolific writer; and his works—_Topographia Cambriae_, _Itinerarium Cambriae_, _Speculum Ecclesiæ_, _Epistulæ_, _Historia Cambriae_, _Itinerarium Cambriae_, _Historia Cambriae_, _Itinerarium Cambriae_, _Historia Cambriae_, _Itinerarium Cambriae_—have their value, in spite of his credulity and vanity. They were best edited by Brewer and Dimock, Lond., 1860-77, in 7 vols. [Of his _Itn. Camb._ there is a translation, with a life of Giraldu, and notes, by R. C. Hoare, Lond., 1866, in 2 vols.]

GIRDLE, among the Hebrews. One of the essential articles of dress in the East, worn alike both by men and women, was the girdle. There were different kinds of girdles, corresponding to their equivalents in the Hebrew. There was (1) the _exor_, denoting something bound, which was worn by men of different states (comp. 2 Kings i. 8; Job xii. 18; Isa. v. 27; Jer. xii. 1; Ezek. xxiii. 15); (2) the _abnet_, or the girdle of sacerdotal and state officers, especially worn by the priests about the close-fitting tunic (Exod xxxviii. 39, xxxix. 20); (3) the _kiduum_, mentioned Isa. iii. 20, which seems to have been a girdle worn by women. In general the girdle was made of leather (2 Kings i. 8; Matt. iii. 4). The nobles wore girdles of linen, four fingers broad, and embossed or studded with all kinds of precious stones, or pearls, or metals (Dan. iii. 6). It was fastened by a clasp or buckle of gold or silver, or tied in a knot. Men wore the girdle about the loins; whilst the women, having generally their girdle looser than that of the men, wore it about the hips, except when they were actively engaged (Prov. xxxi. 17). The military girdle was worn about the waist; the sword or dagger was suspended from it (Judg. iii. 18; 2 Sam. xx. 8; Ps. xiv. 3). Here girding up the loins denotes preparation for battle (1 Kings xxviii. 46; 2 Kings iv. 29); whilst to "loose the girdle" was to give way to repose and indolence (Isa. v. 27). It was a token of great confidence and assurance to loose the girdle, and give way to another (1 Sam. xviii. 4). Girdles were used as a kind of purse (Matt. x. 9; Mark vi. 8); and inkhorns were also carried in them (Ezek. ix. 2).

GLANVIL, Joseph, a philosophical divine of the Church of England; b. in Plymouth 1636; d. in Bath, Nov. 4, 1680. After graduation at Oxford he took orders, and was for a time chaplain to the king; in 1666 elected to the Royal Society, of which he was a vigorous defender, and in 1678 appointed a prebendary of Worcester. He was the leader of the philosophical sceptics, who "attacked all philosophy by denying the self-evident and authoritative character of its original categories and axioms, and resolved all trustworthy knowledge into the vague operations of experience, supplemented by the testimony of revelation, or into what could be verified by physical experiment." But his motive in the fostering scepticism was to maintain a religion against all attacks. His principal work was _Scopis Scientifca_, or Conuest Ignorance the Way to Science, an Essay of the Vanity of Dogmatizing and Confident Opinion (Lond., 1665), which was an enlargement of his first work, _The Vanity of Dogmatizing_ (1661). He believed in witches, and wrote _Philosophical Considerations on the Existence of Sorcerers and Sorcery_ (1666), and.
Sadducimus Triumphans, or a Full and Plain Evidence concerning Witches and Apparitions (ed. by Dr. Henry More, who gave an account of his life and writings, 1061, 2d ed., 1082).

Glass, John, b. in Pitlochry, Sept. 21, 1685; d. at Dundee, 1773; minister of the kirk at Telling, 1719; deposed by the General Assembly in 1728, in consequence of his publication, in the previous year, of a book in which he maintained that an Established Church was contrary to the Gospel. He gathered a sect called in Scotland Glassites, but in England and America Sandemanians (which see). His works appeared at Edinburgh, 1761, 2d ed., Perth, 1782, 5 vols.

Glassius, Salomo, b. at Sondershausen, 1093; d. at Gotha, July 27, 1050; studied theology, especially the Semitic languages, at Jena and Wittenberg, and was made professor of theology at Jena in 1637, and superintendent-general of Saxo-Gotha in 1640. His principal work was his Philologia Sacra, a combination of a critical and historical introduction to the Bible and a biblical hermeneutics. It appeared in 1625, was much appreciated at its time, and often reprinted. The general theological standpoint of the author forms a transition from the old orthodoxy to the Pietism of Spener.

Glebe (church land), most commonly the land belonging to a parish church, besides the tithes. There are several important statutes in relation to glebes, dating from the reign of Henry VIII. Originally every church had a house for the minister, and a glebe: indeed, there could be no consecration where these were not.

Gloria in excelsis. See Doxology.

Gloria Patri. See Doxology.

Glory. See Nimbus.

Glosses, Biblical. The word “gloss,” which is derived from the Greek glossa, denotes not only tongue and language, but was also used among grammarians to denote any note appended to a word or phrase for the purpose of interpretation or illustration. Works containing such notes were called “glossaries,” and comprised not only the wide range of philology, but also science, medicine, geography, etc., and even the sacred literature of the Bible. Notes thereon were called “sacred glosses.” Before, however, such glosses were noted down, the text of the Bible had been the subject of exegetical studies; and the word “glosses,” which among the Greeks denoted the word to be interpreted, was used among the Latins for the “explanation itself.” In the latter sense it was used among the Christian writers of the middle ages, and is still used in our own days.

Almost as old as writing itself is the habit of placing annotations in the margin, either explanatory or otherwise, of the text. This was especially the case with the Bible; partly because it was read more than any other book, partly because it was read by such who needed an explanation, or believed themselves fit for making explanations. At first very brief, often confined to a single word, these glosses grew finally into more extended remarks. In the Hebrew codices these glosses were the source of not a few of the keri readings; and the glosses on the margins of the codices of the Septuagint and the New Testament have given rise to many of the readings which exist in both of these, an elimination of which requires sound and cautious judgment. The more difficult the understanding of the sacred writings was regarded, the longer were the marginal annotations (glosses marginales), which were especially made on the text of the Vulgate, some grammatical, some historical, some theological, some allegorical and mystical. The most famous collection of these glosses marginales is that of Walafrid Strabo, made in the ninth century, which became the great exegetical thesaurus of the middle ages, and was known as the Glossa Ordinaria. Besides notes being written in the margin, there were also such as were written between the lines (glossa interlinearis); and a collection of the latter was made by Anselm of Laon in the beginning of the twelfth century. Both works were often printed together. In the last century special attention was given to these glosses: such is the work of Ernesti, entitled Glossae Sacrae, Leipzig, 1785.

Glosses, or, as they are usually denominated, critical or critical, practical application was at the different versions. Those made by the Genevan translators particularly excited the dislike of King James, and made him ready to second Dr. Reynold's proposition for a new translation of the Bible on the second day of the Hampton Court Conference (Monday, Jan. 16, 1694). His objection to them was their alleged seditious and traitorous character, because they struck at the doctrine of the divine right of kings. The Bishop of London, therefore, proposed, that, in the new translation, there should be no marginal notes; to which the King said, “That care is well put in.” Nevertheless the King James Version has such notes, although of very limited scope,—mere various readings, in most cases. There was some complaint at the omission of the Geneva annotations. See Fuller, Church Hist., Bk. X., Cent. xvii., Sects. 1, 2, and 3, Ep. 41, Nichol's ed., vol. iii., pp. 203 sqq., 276. The revised version of 1881 has also glosses, in which the various readings of ancient manuscripts are given. Many of the marginal readings of the British revisers should be substituted for those in the text, in the judgment of their American fellow-laborers.

Glosses and Glossatores. After the overthrow of the West Roman Empire in Italy, Roman law gradually lost its authority in practical life, and, as a natural consequence thereof, also its theoretical interest as a study; until at the end of the eleventh, or the beginning of the twelfth century, both were revived by the foundation of the law-school at Bologna by one Innenius (Warnerius, Guarnierius). The fame of this school soon gathered a great number of pupils from all parts of Europe; and thereby was not only the scientific treatment of the Roman law advanced, but its practical application at the same time inaugurated. The teachers, however, did not confine themselves to lecturing: a literary activity also developed. Explanations of single words or phrases, and illustrations of positive facts or relations, were put down in the form of short notes, between the lines (interlinear glosses) or in the margin (marginal glosses); and, besides such short notes, the glossatores also produced sumaria (or surveys of the contents of a chapter), causae (or fictitious cases illustrative of...
certain principles), questiones, distinctiones, etc. From the Roman law this method was transferred to canon law, and flourished among the canonists of the University of Paris no less than among the legists of Bologna. Several of the pupils of Gratian wrote glosses on his decretum; and in 1212 Johannes Teutonicus undertook to gather these glosses into a continuous commentary on the decretum, called an apparatus, or glossa ordinaria. Similar glossa ordinaria were also made to the decretals of Gregory IX., the Liber sextus, the Clementines, and Extravagantes, and are of great value, not only scientific, but also historical. See SARTI: De claris archiyygmnasiis Bonon. professoribus, 1769.

GLOUCESTER, capital city of the county of the same name; situated on the Severn, 106 miles north-west from London; population 18,330; founded by the Romans under the name of Aulus Plautius; called by the Saxons Gleannastea; is one of the most famous cities of England. Here was the favorite residence of Edward the Conqueror and the Norman kings; here Charles I. was imprisoned, and Charles II. found a refuge in Friesland. He, 1493; d. at Norden, Sept. 9, 1568; a noted dietician, was dragged from one theological disputation into another, condemned and excommunicate, and banished, 1547. He sought to lift himself up to the divine kingdom, and his kinship with God, and will be completely emancipated. The former is almost synonymous with the question concerning the origin of evil; which Tertullian, with other polemical writers, regarded as the main subject of Gnostic thought. In the latter, the purification and deliverance of the soul, it agitated one of the profoundest thoughts of Christianity.

Influenced by Hellenic philosophy, the Gnostics subordinated the will to knowledge, and represented experimental Christianity as knowledge rather than faith, and made knowledge the standard of the moral condition. They would have changed the consecution of Christ's words in Matt. v. 8 to the statement, "They that see God are pure in heart." They were influenced by the aristocratic class-feeling of the Greek philosopher, who regarded himself as lifted above the religious creed and humiliating occupations of the multitude. It continued in a lower stage of knowledge characterized by faith. Upon the believer who held to the letter they looked down with contempt. Faith was in this way made a principle of separation by Gnosticism; while Christianity makes it the bond of union and brotherhood between all men. The Gnostic divided mankind into three classes,—spiritual (νευσματικος), psychic, and carnal (νευωσιν, νασικος, etc.) beings. The last class are controlled by passions, and instincts. Matter is the source of chaotic movement and sinful desire; fact, and the early development of a Christian philosophy in Alexandria, lead us to the conclusion that it was used at a very early date in that city. Gnosticism was used in contrast not only to πραπτος, or "faith," but also to the pagan philosophia. On the other side, with Pagan thought; and the attempt of philosophy, on the other, to harmonize Christian revelation with its own systems. It gave up the monotheism of the Scriptures, limited the canon, and allegorized away, in part or in whole, the great facts of Christ's work and person. Gnosticism drew largely from the Greek systems of Plato and the Stoics; but that which is characteristic was derived from Oriental religions. It incorporated their bald Dualism; while Greek philosophy, for the most part, favors the Pantheistic conception of the universe. As a rule, it represented individual life as the result of a process of emanation from the original essence; while Greek speculation taught a process of development by evolution in an ascending scale from chaos. Unlike Greek systems, its thought was not methodical, but poetical, and charged with Oriental imagery and freedom. The Gnostics, likewise, showed their preference for Oriental mythologies in the names of the angels. Parseeism with its fully-developed idea of God as light, Chaldean astrology (in Bardeanes and Saturninus here to be studied) and Chinese acetic tendency,—all combined with the Syrian and Phoenician mythologies to give to Gnosticism its Oriental coloring.

The principal task which Gnosticism proposed for itself was to lead man by speculative knowledge to salvation. The chief questions which pressed upon it for solution were how the human spirit became imprisoned in matter, and how it might be emancipated. The former is almost synonymous with the question concerning the origin of evil; which Tertullian, with other polemical writers, regarded as the main subject of Gnostic thought. In the latter, the purification and deliverance of the soul, it agitated one of the profoundest thoughts of Christianity.
Different writers have endeavored to derive the various phases of Gnosticism from a single leading principle. Baur finds it in the idea of the absolute religion of which it treats when it discusses the agreements and disagreements of Christianity on the one hand, and Paganism and Judaism on the other. Lipsius finds it in the distinction between knowledge and faith. Without denying this antithesis, Neander and Hilgenfeld represent the person of the World-Creator as the point of departure. This mythological figure is called by Valentinus (following Plato), Demiurge; by Basilides, Archon; and by Ophitic sects, Jaldabaoth, or Son of Chaos. This is, at any rate, the most characteristic figure in Gnostic systems, and concentrates in itself its most important ideas. The introduction of this being between God and the visible universe grows out of the antithesis of God and matter. This speculative Dualism leads to a religious Dualism, which sets the God of the New Testament in sharp contrast to the God of the Old Testament. The Demiurge is almost invariably represented as having a very subordinate activity, compared with God (and Justinus is the only one who even ascribes to him a spiritual or pneumatic nature), and then he is devoid of the foreknowledge of God. The spirits which proceed from God are high above him. He belongs to the world, and marks the chasm between it and God. The description of his creative work draws largely from the first chapters of Genesis. He is the God of the Jews. But his kingdom is broken into by the kingdom of Satan and by that of spiritual or pneumatic life.

The classification of Gnostic sects offers much difficulty. Since the discovery of Hippolytus, the difficulty has become greater on account of the additional systems he brings to our notice. He also has made it apparent that the Pantheistic conception also had some currency, as well as the Dualistic, among the Gnostics. Gieseler groups them into Alexandrian, in which Platonic influences are potent, and Syrian, in which there is a stronger Dualism. But, by his own confession, the system of the Syrian Marcion does not favor this division. The classification, on the basis of religious influence, which Hase makes into Oriental, Hellenic, Christian, and Jewish, is inexact. Lipsius, on the double basis of date of origin and characteristics, distinguishes three stadia: (1) Early Gnosticism, in which elements of Syrian mythologies were blended with the Judeo-Christian ideas; (2) Hellenic Gnosticism, beginning with the assumed transition of Basilides to Alexandria; (3) A stage in which speculation wanes, and the conflict of Gnosticism against faith ceases. Here belongs Marcion. The alleged transition from a Syrian to Hellenic Gnosticism in Basilides is not borne out by facts. The two developed contemporaneously. In Alexandria, Gnosticism was strong as early as the middle of the second century. Cerinthus began his career there; and, if we follow the account of Hippolytus, Basilides belonged there. Baur arranges the systems thus: (1) Such as combine Christianity with Judaism and Paganism (Basilides, Valentinus, the Ophites); (2) Such as oppose Christianity to both (Marcion); (3) Such as, identifying Judaism and Christianity, oppose them to Paganism (Clementine Homilies).

A better grouping than either of these is Neander's, who distinguishes two main classes,—the Judaizing and Anti-Judaistic. They prefer a classification based upon historical development, and distinguish (1) The period of apocryphal Gnosticism at the close of the first century, (2) The period of greatest fertility of speculation till the middle of the third, (3) The period of decay in which there is little of original thought after the fifth century there are no new systems, (4) The revival of Gnostic ideas about the seventh century in the sect of the Cathari. We shall here concern ourselves only with the first two classes.

Gnosticism exerted a powerful reflex influence upon the Church. When the Church was about to sink into a stagnant literalism, and into formalism of life, the idealistic speculation of the Gnostics gave her an impulse towards thought, and a more comprehensive discussion of doctrine. The consequence was, that those points in which Christianity is distinct from Judaism and Paganism were investigated and emphasized. The Alexandrian school of theologians, more than any others, strove to make this the Church's fundamental doctrines; it gave also the stimulus to exegetical labors by itself leading the way. Basilides and Heracleon were the first to comment upon whole Gospels. The Gnostics also preceded in the department of religious poetry. Learning, as she did, from Gnosticism, the Church, on the other hand, gathered more closely about her bishops, and emphasized more strongly her distinctive doctrines, peculiar rites, and apostolic origin.

[Gnosticism was the Rationalism of the ancient Church. It was an effort of profound speculative thought to bring the Christian revelation into harmony with reason. It brought forward the distinguishing principles of Hellenic philosophy, Oriental theosophy, and the Jewish religion, and compared the great ideas of Christianity with them. Christianity was often clothed in fantastic drapery, and associated with grotesque images; but it was always declared superior to any thing that had preceded it. This movement of thought was perhaps inevitable; but the Gnosticism of the early Church is distinguished from the Rationalism of our century by having been confined to the speculations of scholars. Modern Gnosticism, as it has gone among the people, may be accounted for by the circumstance that the people then saw more plainly the effects of non-Christian thought and life upon the world, and knew more clearly the superior merit and power of Christianity over all the systems that had preceded it.]

The first period of Gnosticism belongs to the close of the first century. The earliest proleptic signs of Gnosticism are to be looked for in Simon Magnus. He was one of the numerous magicians of the East who pretended to have the power of
working miracles. Judaistic Gnosticism is pre-
figured by the false teachers against whom Paul
contends in his Epistle to the Colossians. With-
out denying the Messianic-office of the Messiah, they
seem to have had a well-developed doctrine of
angels, who, perhaps, were regarded as having
participated in the creation. There are also
traces of Gnosticism in the Epistles to Timothy.
The First Epistle of John opposes Docetism. At
the close of the apostolic age, Cerinthus was
active in part of Asia Minor where John labored. He retained some doctrines of the Old
Testament, but placed at the side of God a World-
Creator, the God of the Jews, who is also the head
of the lower angels. Jesus was the son of Joseph
and Mary. The Redeemer descended upon him
at his baptism, and left him just before the pas-
sion.

The golden period of Gnosticism closed about
the middle of the third century. After the first
decades of the second century, Gnostic specula-
tion was fruitful of systems to an extent of which
there is no parallel in the history of philosophy,
even at the highest ages of Greek or modern. Starting from Egypt
and Syria, they extended themselves to the re-
 mote part of the Church, even as far as Edessa
and Lyons. The distinctive Gnostic features are
more clearly outlined, and the various schools
stand in relations of antagonism or friendship.
We pass now to a description of the Gnostic sys-
tems in detail.

I. Judaizing Gnostics. BASILIDES.—Two di-
vergent accounts of the system of Basilides have
come down to us. Irenæus and Epiphanius de-
scribe it as teaching a bold Dualism, and draw in
vergent accounts of the system of Basilides have
mention Isidore, the son and disciple of Basilides.
Clement and Hippolytus, on the other hand, seem
to have had access to the writings of both.

The following is an outline of the Basilidean
system. God is the Unnamable, and, in contrast
to all other beings, he may be called the Non-
Existent One; for he is so high above us, that we
cannot affirm of him any predicates. He discards
the doctrine of emanation commonly held by the
Gnostics. Matter is not eternal, but the product
of divine creation. Far beneath his throne, God
deposits the seed, out of which, as from an egg,
the world bursts and develops. The expression,
"seed of the world," is Stoic; and the illustration
of the egg, originally Oriental, was adopted ex-
tensively in the cosmogonic poetry of the Greeks.
This seed is conceived of as a chaotic mixture of
the three elements in the world,—the spiritual
or pneumatic, the psychic, and the hylic. The
spiritual or pneumatic first detaches itself; and
the most subtle and ethereal portion of it swells
into a body, with the result that it becomes God.
To it belong the highest spirits,— Mind, Word,
Intelligence, Wisdom, Power, Justice, Peace,—
which, with the Father, constitute the great Og-
doad, the type of the lower spheres. The second
class of pneumatic beings exist beneath these.
Out of the psychic, or intermediary and ruling of the world, the Archon, who, without
being conscious of it, is governed by the divine
laws. With the aid of astronomical forces he
forms three hundred and sixty-five heavens, the
lowest of which stretches from the moon down-
wards. A lower Archon presides over this sphere. God uses both Archons for his purposes.
The lower Archon appropriates to himself the
Jewish people, reveals himself in the Old Testa-
ment, and also to the heathen world. Prophecy
begots a longing for deliverance from the fetters
of matter. When the fulness of time had come,
the Redeemer was born of the virgin. At the
baptism he was endowed with new spiritual
powers, and, after preaching the higher knowl-
edge of salvation, was put to death. Christ died
on account of the remainders of sin left in him,
but also to deliver the children of God from the
fetters of matter. The process of deliverance is
now going on, and will be completed when all
pneumatic beings are gathered to God. Basili-
des and his son Isidore, who wrote a work on
ethics, taught a moderate asceticism. The for-
mer appeals to the apostle Mathias, and used the
Gospel of John, for which and the Epistles to
the Corinthians, Ephesians, and Romans, he is the
first witness. See art. BASILIDES.

VALENTINUS.—All that we know of the life
of this teacher is, that he came to Rome in the
days of Bishop Hyginus (about 136), was at the
height of his influence under Pius (about 165),
and was teaching until the administration of
Anicetus (about 186). It is certain that he
hated from the East. But Tertullian's state-
ment, that he broke with the Church, and was
repeatedly excommunicated, is suspicious. Val-
entinus was endowed with rich powers of mind.
His system is the most artistic of all the Gnostic
systems. It is an epic describing creation, apos-
tasy, and redemption, in two spheres,— heaven
and earth.

God is unfathomable profundity, and the most
sufficient name for him is Abyss (βῶθος). For
endless ages he remains in silent, undisturbed
comprehend God. Her sinful passion disturbs
the harmony in the Pleroma, and, being separated
from herself, is placed outside of the Pleroma.
This marks the transition to the world. Har-
mony is restored; and out of gratitude the
Æons construct out of their best gifts the finest
Æon of all,— the star in the divine fulness, the
upper Christ, who is surrounded by hoists of
angels. Valentinus seems not to be clear about
matter. It is either identical with the expelled
νάσος ("passion"), or exists, distinct from the
Pleroma, as Kenoma, or the Void. But in Sophia
matter is of one kind with the world itself.

The second part of the system descends to the
formation of the visible world. The separated part, or νεκρος, still has pneumatic life. She is the product of Sophia, and called Achamoth, from the Hebrew Chochmah ("wisdom"). From her proceed the fundamental elements of the world. She delegates the formation of the world and man to the Demiurge, who dwells in the seventh heaven. Man lives at first in paradise, the third heaven, but repeats the apostasy, and is cast down to earth. The Demiurge sends the Messiah, upon whom the Εον Christ descends. But only the human Messiah dies, the Εον leaving him before his passion. After the resurrection, the Messiah tarried eighteen months among the disciples, teaching them the mysteries of the divine Pleroma. All pneumatic beings will be completely delivered. The Demiurge, who humbled himself before the Εον Christ as he passed through his kingdom, will lift up the righteous psychic beings to a place where they will hear the jubilant echoes of the Pleroma. Then fire will consume matter and the psychic evil-doers.

Marcus of Palestine. The correspondence of the Chaldaean astrology. But in his Docetic system was monistic. All life, by an ever-expanding recession, emanates from the triune. In the limits of the divine development is matter, wherein the spirits who are finally fallen away from God have their habitation. Epiphanius his son, who wrote a work on Justice, followed closely his father's system. The Antinomianism of the Carpocratians gave occasion to the heathen world for accusations against the Christians, with whom it identified them.

SIMON MAGUS (Acts viii. 9, 10) was, as early as the second century, denounced by the Church as the arch-heretic, and founder of Gnosticism. Although he professed to be a believer (Acts viii. 13), he gave himself out as "the Great Power of God." A sect in the second century derived their origin from him, regarding his authority as coordinate with that of the apostles. The tradition ran, that he purchased a harlot at Tyre. He allowed her to be worshipped as his first conception (Ennoia), who created the angels. These form the world; but she maddens them by her charms, so that they indulge in lust, to which the Homeric poems refer. Simon appears to deliver Enoch; and, like her, all Gnostics will be delivered.

Clement of Alexandria mentions a number of sects which belong here, and which he describes merely on the side of their moral teachings. Pantheism was common to them all. The Anti-

TACTES hoped to attain salvation by dedication of the moral law, thereby defeating the Demiurge. So, also, the followers of Proculus, who proudly applied to themselves the name Gnostics. The Nicolaitans appealed to the deacon Nicolaus (Acts vi. 5) as their authority, and likewise taught the freedom of the flesh. They have no connection with the sect of the same name in the Apocalypse.

IV. The Ophites. — This class of Gnostics—called by Hippolytus Ophites, by Clement of Alexandria Ophians—give a prominent place in their systems to the serpent,—a demon now of evil, now of good. In doing this they were in the line of the mythologies of ancient Babylon (in which the seven-headed serpent fights against the powers of light), of Persia, and of Egypt. The apocryphal literature of the Jews also refers frequently to the serpent. The Ophites drew largely
also, from Greek philosophy. The sharp antithesis in which they set Judaism and Christianity, and the preponderance of the Pharisees precludes the theory that they were of Jewish origin.

Justinus, whose system Hypolitus has noticed, was more largely influenced by Old-Testament ideas than any other of the Ophites. From an original good and male being there proceeded a female being, Edem, whose upper part was human, was the source of all strength and goodness (Edem, Elohim) emanates from God. He has intercourse with Edem, and begats two kinds of beings corresponding to her twofold nature. Forsaken by him, Edem fills the earth with evils. Elohim seeks to draw men upwards, loves the Jews, and reveals himself through Baruch, one of the angels, to Moses and the prophets. These are, however, traduced by Edem. Elohim then turns to the prophets of the heathen world. They share the same fate. Baruch finally finds in Jesus, the Son of Mary and Joseph, a firm opponent of Edem. He resists all temptations of the serpent, and his crucifixion is brought about by it. This opens the way for the complete separation of the earthly and the heavenly; Christ's spirit having gone to Elohim, and the body to Edem.

The Ophites of Irenaeus place Christianity in sharper antagonism to the Demiurge. Dualism is distinctly avowed. On the one side is Bythos, the divine being; on the other, matter, a desolate ocean made up of water, darkness, chaos, and abyss. From the mingling of the light with matter proceeds Jaldabaoth, the Son of Chaos. He is the World-Creator. Looking down with grim hatred upon Hyle, his diabolic image is produced, — Ophiomorphus, or the "crooked serpent" (Isa. xxvii. 1). From him go forth all evil, sorrow, and death. He dominates Cain and the heathen; Jaldabaoth, the Jews, and inspires Moses and other prophets. But he crucifies Jesus, upon whom the heavenly Christ had descended, and does not share in the kingdom of light. But Christ brings salvation to all pneumatic beings.

The Sethians used a "Paraphrase of Seth," whencesoever their name. Matter is an ocean, tempestuous, chaotic, dark. The light excites the serpent-soul in matter, which then becomes the Demiurge. The Logos descends from the light, deceives the Demiurge by assuming the form of a serpent, and lifts the soul up to the realm of light.

The Naaseni (serpent-worshippers) flourished in Phrygia. They taught that the serpent emanates from God, and is the soul of the world. Christ does not redeem men by his death, but by his gnosia and teaching.

The Perate, as their name signifies, looked upon themselves as belonging to another world, and as only in a state of transition in this. They thrust about 150; for Clement of Alexandria mentions them. The Archon of matter is a hylic demon, and his companions are the poisonous serpents of the desert. The serpent, as the apostle of wisdom, frees Eve from the bondage of the Archon. To it belong Cain, Nimrod, and, none less, Moses, who lift up serpent in the wilderness. But it is like serpents to wear a mask. C. Augerus is Judas the true apostle. Thus the whole story of the Gospels was completely inverted, the serpent being regarded as the symbol of intellect, who first gave true knowledge to our first parents, and the very betrayer of Christ declared to be the highest apostle.

The various Gnostic sects described by Epiphanius — the Philionites, Stratiotes, etc. — were distinguished by a moral rottenness which almost staggers belief. On the one hand, theology and apologetics had shown the vast superiority of Christianity to Gnosticism; on the other, Gnostic sects, once with no light (network), now, denigrated, that no doubt was left that its time was past.

His work in the Holy City was very successful and vigorous. Particularly worthy of mention is the Diocesan School and the Orphanage on Mount Zion. In November, 1847, he began with nine children in the former; when he died, there were in Palestine, under his care, 57 schools, with 1,400 children. He also had under him twelve native churches. He had an efficient helper in his wife. He wrote *A Journal of Three Years in Abyssinia*, London, 1847. See *Samuel Gobat: Sein Leben und Werken, meist nach seinen eigenen Aufzeichnungen*, Basel, 1884. English trans., London, 1884.

**GOCH, Johannes,** or properly Johannes Pupper; was b. at Goch, near Aix-la-Chapelle, in the beginning of the fifteenth century, and probably educated in one of the establishments of the Brethren of Common Life. Studied in Paris, and founded the priory of Thabor, for canoneses of St. Augustine, in Mechlin, which he governed himself till 1475. His first (Ezek. iii. 11 sqq.) was published in 1521, by Corvus-Graphicus, it attracted great attention, and its author was recognized as one of the true predecessors of the Reformation. See ULLMANN: *Die Reformatoren vor der Reformation,* I. p. 168.

**GOD.** I. NAME AND GENERAL IDEA.—Although the existence of God is the most certain of all facts for Christians and religious people generally, and although all moral and religious life depends upon him for its motives and aims, yet Christian theologians of every period have agreed that it is impossible to give an exhaustive definition of his being. This is due to the fact that God neither stands in a relation such as exists between genus and species, nor can be included in a class with other persons under a single genus. Yet all systems of religion have had positive notions of the Deity. Common to all has been the idea that he is a being superior to man and nature, and controls, to some extent, man's destiny. His will, which is regarded in the lowest religions as despotical and arbitrary, is defined in the higher religions as almighty, originating and controlling all things. Speculative thought takes a step higher when it represents this will, upon which all depends, as unconditioned by any thing outside of itself, and eternal. But it remains for the Christian revelation to add the most important feature; namely, that God is a moral being, absolutely good, and guiding the world to a perfect consummation. Of the two names for God which the Hebrews had in common with other Semitic peoples, *El* expresses the notion of power, and *Elohim* represents him as an object of awe and dread. But neither contains any allusion to God's redeeming love. Our *God* is not connected etymologically with *good* (Max Muller, 2d series, p. 148), but is probably derived from the Sanscrit *jut* or *dyut,* Gothic, *gutha,* meaning to shine. The same word is the root of the Latin *Deus* and the Greek *Zeus.*

II. GOD IN THE SCRIPTURES.—Characteristic of the Old-Testament revelation of God is the moral relation he sustains to the world. The Old Testament does not give theoretical definitions of the Divine Being; or arguments for his existence, but assumes the belief in him. The religious reverence and fear which are becoming in our relations to him are based upon his moral elevation, his absolute holiness, which cannot be tolerated sin. Jehovah, the name which indicates God's covenant relation to Israel, designates the immutability and absoluteness of his being. God is a personal spirit, not a force of nature. He is separate from all that is created and moving principle of all life (Ps. civ. 29 sqq., etc.), and particularly of man's life (Gen. ii. 7; Job xxxiii. 4, etc.). The earth is a monument revealing his glory (Num. xiv. 21, etc.). The plural form of the divine name *Elohim* points to his infinite fulness of life. Although the holiness of God is the predominant conception of the Old Testament, the thought of divine love and grace is not wanting. God in mercy chooses Israel to be his people, and desires to be called Father (Exod. iv. 22 sqq.; Deut. xxxii. 6; Isa. lixii. 16: Hos. xi. 1). He effaces guilt, purifies the heart, and becomes present in the Spirit (John vi. 46, etc.). It is this ethical and religious conception of God, and not the divine unity, or Monotheism, which is the distinguishing feature of the Old-Testament revelation.

The New Testament is characterized by the presentation of God as the Father of Jesus Christ and of those who belong to his kingdom. The relation is now strictly a personal one, the Old Testament representing God as the Father of a people. We are made God's children by a new birth (John i. 12; 1 John iii. 9). Thus, having become partakers of the divine life (2 Pet. i. 4), we shall at last be filled with "all the fulness of God" (Eph. iii. 19). God himself lives and works in them (Eph. iv. 6). He is in a peculiar sense the Father of Christ, who was begotten before the worlds (John i. 1 sqq.), and possesses the divine fulness (Col. ii. 9). In the name *Father* the principle of love is contained. "God is love" (1 John iv. 8), and this love controls his use of all the other attributes. It leads God to reveal himself in the gift of his Son (1 John iv. 10, etc.), and to take men into communion with himself. God is also light or holiness (1 John i. 5) and spirit (John iv. 26), and has eternal life (Rev. i. 4, 8). Man derives from God's works the knowledge of his invisible being and power (Rom. i. 20). As the God of love and light, he is revealed to us through Moses and the Prophets, and perfectly in the person of his own Son (John i. 18, xiv. 9). This knowledge which the believer has of God depends upon God's own special agency through the Spirit (Matt. xvi. 17; John vi. 44, etc.). Our present knowledge, however, is imperfect. "We see through a glass darkly" (1 Cor. xiii. 12; 2 Cor. v. 7, etc.). But in Christ, who is his image (2 Cor. iv. 4), we see God's deepest secrets, revealed, etc., from him derive all the knowledge necessary for salvation and for consummate communion with God.

III. GOD IN CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY.—Theology cannot be entirely divorced from philosophy. And, fixed as the notion of God is which the Scriptures present, it was proper, as well as unavoidable, that it should be subjected to the scrutiny of reason. In its infancy Christian theology came in contact with the products of Greek philosophy, and was influenced by the definitions of Plato, the Neo-Platonists, and of Philo, who himself owed much, directly or indirectly, to Plato.
The general influence of these extra-Christian forces was in the direction of a negative and abstract conception of the Deity. In Gnosticism this abstractly conceived God is transformed into the dark background, which, according to Valentinus, is the first beginning and cause of all things, and has Silence (οὐδεμία) for a consort. (See Gnosticism.) Within the Church itself the apologological writers who followed him, and especially the Alexandrine school, emphasized with Plato God's transcendence above nature; although the Scriptures always affirm, at the side of this, that he is a personal, holy, and loving Spirit. The more the influence of philosophy was felt, the more prominently did Christian theologians urge the negative and abstract element in God's nature. Origen defined him as simple being, without predicates, exalted above self through him. In contrast to this tendency the theology was essentially Neo-Platonic. He taught that God's nature is absolutely indefinable, but at the same time speaks of a union with God which is nothing more than an ecstatic rapture, by which we become lost in the mystery of the Deity. The Areopagite's writings exerted an extensive influence upon the mysticism of after-periods in church history. Augustine was the first in the Western Church to concern himself with the scientific investigation of the divine nature. He laid stress, first of all, upon the self-conscious personality of God; but Platonic influence is evident in his further prosecution of the subject, when he defines God as the unity of all abstract perfections, as an absolutely simple essence, in which knowledge, volition, being, and all attributes, are one and the same.

The writings of Dionysius were given to the Western Church in the translation of Scotus Erigena. This being, the absolute, belongs only to God; so that whatever in finite things truly exists is nought else than God himself. This is Pantheism, from the charge of which he rescues himself by illogically teaching the doctrines of Creation and the Trinity. Scholasticism was under the immediate influence of Augustine, in its definition of God. Realism, if pressed, would have forced it to the conclusion that the Infinite only exists as it is found in the finite. But from this it held back. Thomas Aquinas and Albertus Magnus said God was not the essence of finite things, but their final cause and original moving principle. On the other hand, Duns Scotus insists that from the beginning God had will, and exercised volition; but this will was essentially absolute and arbitrary. Occam strongly emphasized this point; whence, from Abelard on, those protracted and subtle discussions whether any thing was impossible for him. In the other case, as the representative of mysticism, finds the aim of life to be to lose one's self in God. His views were extensively adopted in pious circles; but pantheistic heretics, the so-called Brothers of the Free Spirit, taught that God was every thing, and man was God, and deduced an immoral Antinomianism from the doctrine. The popular mind, in the Middle Ages, demanded mediators and intercessors in its approach to God; so that Luther afterwards complained that he was no longer regarded as a being full of love and compassion, but as a stern governor.

Avoiding the metaphysical subtleties of scholasticism, the Reformers emphasized the proposition that God is the God of redemption, who threatens the sinner with the curse and death, but subordinates every thing to his purpose of saving the lost. The dogmatic divergencies of the Lutheran and Reformed confessions point back to different conceptions of God's nature. The latter emphasized more strongly God's sovereignty, and the eternal decree by which he rejects a portion of the race. Against this the Lutheran theology guards. However, it must not be forgotten that Luther, in his earlier writings, predicates the same decree of God, and that he never subsequently, in a systematic way, contradicted this position. The theology of the next period enumerated the divine attributes under the heads "natural" and "moral." and affirmed, that, though our knowledge of God cannot be exhaustive, it is real, and sufficient for salvation. Socinianism presented God in the aspect of a Ruler endowed with consummate power and justice, whose knowledge of the future, however, is conditioned by the free will of man, which acts independently of him.

At the side of the traditional doctrine of the Church, philosophy now began to work out independent metaphysical systems. Spinoza's pantheism was condemned by theologians as palpably unchristian, yea, godless. But the philosophy of Leibnitz and Wolff enjoyed wide favor. It treated at length the arguments for God's existence, but replaced them by the moral argument, based upon the intuitive facts of the conscience and the moral law. Fichte and Albertus Magnus said God was not the other, but subordinates every thing to his purpose of salvation. Against this the Lutheran theology guards. However, it must always be ready to confess the imperfection of its definition of God. But this can never justify that school of thought which turns the
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living God into an abstraction, called the Absolute, which neither explains any thing, nor is itself intelligible.

[See the Histories of Christian Doctrine of Baur, Hagenbach, and Shedd; Gillett: God in Human Thought, New York, 1874, 2 vols.; also the works on Systematic Theology, by Hodge (vol. i.), V. van Oosterzee, and Brough (§§ 15–27); and the excellent art. God, in Johnson's Cyclopædia, by Dr. A. A. Hodge.—On the Cognoscenti-

derwood: Philosophy of the Infinite; McCosh: The Supernatural in relation to the Natural, New York, 1882.]

GOD. I. ARGUMENTS FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.—The statement of St. Paul, that the "world by wisdom knew not God" (1 Cor. i. 21), is strictly true in the light of the history of religious sys-

tems. No heathen religion ever embodied the true conception of God: some of them had the most monstrous conceptions of him. The high-
est achievements of the best human systems of philosophy, such as Plato's, need to be supple-
mented by revelation. For Christians, sufficient proofs of the divine existence will always be the person, words, and works of Christ. So-called rational arguments have by some been considered impossible, on the ground that God is incompre-

hensible to rational thought (Jacobi). Others, from Arzobius down to Watson, the celebrated Methodist theologian (Theol. Institutes), have re-

garded them as either improper or superfluous. While they are in no wise essential to Christian piety, yet they have their place as attempts to show the accord of reason and revelation, and as a demonstration of the inadequacy of the former as compared with revelation. Before Kant sent forth his disparaging criticism, philosophy and theology dwelt extensively on the arguments: since that time, they have met with a varying fate. Schleiermacher's example in excluding them from his system of theology has been fol-

lowed by not a few theologians (Thomasius, Philippi, etc.).

The arguments may be grouped in two classes, — those derived from a contemplation of our-

selves, or the ontological and moral arguments; and those derived from a contemplation of the universe, or the cosmological and teleological arguments.

1. The Ontological Argument. — This proof

argues from the pure intellectual idea of God up to the reality of his existence. The first to give a formula in this form was Anselm. He reasons as follows: There is Something than which noth-

ing greater can be conceived. Even the fool who says, "There is no God," has this idea; for he understands what is meant when he hears the proposition. But this "Something," etc., must exist in reality (in re), as well as in the intellect (in conceptu); for if it exist only in the intel-

lect, then something greater than it could be con-

ceived, viz., that "Something" having objective existence; which is contradictory. Therefore that "Something," etc., exists in reality, as well as in the intellect. Clean as this argumentation seems to be, it is not free from serious logical

error. It may be fairly questioned whether the first statement does not itself posit as having objective existence what it sets out to prove to exist. However, leaving this aside, the great objection lies in comparing that which has objec-

tive existence with a conception considered as having mere subjective existence, and declaring

the former to be greater than the latter. A thing in real existence is exactly equal to its correspond-

ent conception in the mind, neither less nor greater than it. A number written out on the slate is just equal to, and not greater than, the conception of that number. Not a single quality is added to the "Something," etc., as an objective reality, which it does not have as an idea. Kant was the first to apply this criticism. "Objective exist-

cence," he said, "is not a real predicate."

Descartes restated the argument: We have the conception of a most perfect Being. He must be an existent Being; to proceed to argue, or we should have a most perfect Being imperfect. Leibnitz added a new element. It is absolutely necessary that something should exist whose existence inheres in its very essence. God is such a being; and such a being, if at all possible, ex-

ists. Wolff in Germany, Dr. Samuel Clarke in England, and others, have made able and elabo-

rate statements of the argument. Dr. Clarke's argument starts with the proposition that some-

thing has existed from eternity, which, he says, "is so evident and undeniable, that no atheist in any age has ever presumed to assert the contrary." The ontological argument will always have a fascination for the mind. It does not prove God's existence; but, to use the language of Professor Flint (Theism, p. 285), it "has at least succeeded in showing, that unless there exists an eternal, infinite, and unconditioned Being, the human mind is in its ultimate principles self-

contradictory and delusive."

2. The Cosmological Argument. — This proof

starts from the sequences or effects in the uni-

verse. Aristotle among the ancients, and Thomas Aquinas and Leibnitz among Christian philoso-

phers, have been its ablest exponents. Dr. Sam-
uel Clarke, Kant, and others have denied its validity. Aquinas' argument was threefold. He argued back from motion to a first Mover, him-

self unmoved; from effects to a sufficient Cause; and from that which is only possible, and may cease to be, to a Being who exist necessarily. The validity of this argument hinges upon the answer to the question whether an endless retrogression of causes and effects is conceivable (regressus in infinitum). If the answer is, that it is impossible for the mind to conceive such a retrogression, then it follows necessarily that there exists an Absolute Essence, uncreated and eternal. But it may, according to Kant, with equal probability be asserted (on the basis of our experience), that such a retrogression is conceivable, and involves nothing contradictory to human experience. We know that every consequence has its antecedent, and every phenomenon its sufficient cause; so that as a phenomenon involves the idea of change. But the world itself may be regarded as an eternally existent essence, containing inherent in itself the germinating and begetting energy to which all phenomena are to be traced. The theory of evolution makes this no more probable
(as some have ventured hastily to assert), but, on the other hand, no less so. The world itself, then, with its living energy, is full of absolute essences. The argument, then, by itself seems to be inconclusive.

3. The Teleological Argument. This proof is the oldest of the arguments. In modern times Paley and the Bridgewater Treatises have ably stated and illustrated the adaptation of means to ends. From these facts it draws the conclusion of a wise Intelligence as their only explanation. The "reign of law" (Duke of Argyll) has been abundantly illustrated and insisted upon; the marvelous order which reigns in the sidereal heavens, the wonderful adaptation of the members of the human body, as the eye and the hand, for the needs of man, the adaptation of the lower creation to supply his wants, etc., have been dwelt upon at length, and used to establish the conclusion that they betray Intelligent Design. This is known as the "physico-teleological," in opposition to the "historico-teleological" argument, which concerns itself with the facts and development of human history. Objections have been urged against the argument from design on two grounds: (1) That what is called design may as justly be called haphazard (the exact adjustment, for example, of the parts of the eye to vision, is indiscutable); but this adjustment is conceivable as the blind combination of nature); (2) A broad class of facts is overlooked by the argument, and proves with equal force the want of design. Blights, famines, diseases, prevail, which interrupt the order of the universe, and interfere with the physical and mental happiness of man, and the life of other creatures. The world has malformations and monstrosities. Men are even born into the world crippled, so as to be unable to reach physical happiness. This class of objections has been ably stated by Mr. Mill, in his Three Essays on Theism. These objections may not be lightly set aside. It may be urged, in refutation of them, that there is an outlying purpose which even these exceptions must serve; that these inconsistencies and discords are apparent, and not real. But this is a mere assumption, which no one can prove without Revelation. On the other hand, if it be granted that there is a preponderance of design or adaptation in the universe, this would fall short of proving that the world is the product of an omnipotent and intelligent Mind. Kant, who rejects the teleological argument, has well urged that at best it would bring us to an Architect of the world, not to a Creator. Even if it be agreed that the teleological argument does not establish the certainty of a supreme creative Intelligence, it cannot be denied that illustrations of design will always be powerful aids to faith for those already religiously disposed. The Scriptures frequently use them. "He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? he that formed the eye, shall he not see?" (Ps. xciv. 9, etc.).

4. The Moral Argument. This proof starts from the facts of man's moral and spiritual nature. Kant, Sin Wiener, Her and others who reject the other arguments, grant the force of this one. It has been stated in different forms.

1. God is a necessary postulate of our whole spiritual nature. The idea of God seems to be germane to the race. From Cicero down, stress has been justly laid on the prevalence among all nations of a belief in a superior being. Again: without God our spiritual natures remain unsatisfied. The personal sense of dependence which expresses itself in prayer is universal. Worldliness and education may lead men to overcome or ignore it; but the new and improved comes out in its power, when, in times of shipwreck or other peril, men cries aloud for help, and, be it observed, not to the forces of nature, but to a supreme Will who exists behind them. (2) The existence of the moral law within us can only be explained on the supposition of a Lawgiver. The sense of right and wrong is universal. Conscience declares them radically antagonistic and irreconcilable: it speaks in defiance of the will, even when that is set against hearing it, and determined to disobey it; and it commands and threatens with authority. Its word is ought, which Kant calls the categorical imperative. (3) Merit and happiness do not always go together in this world. Our sense of right demands that this should be the case, and forces us to believe in a just God, who in another world will rectify the inequalities of this.

The objections urged against the moral argument are two. (1) That the mind of man is a hopeless enigma, and full of intuitive delusions; and that the universe is a cavernous mystery, if God do not exist. The beliefs of the great mass of mankind, as well as the confident assertion of the best philosophies, have alike been groundless, and the most ennobling counsels and the finest moral achievements been built upon a falsehood, unless he rule and govern. The human intellect shrinks from these awful inferences, and is forced, in spite of the apparent contradictions, to bow with Revelation before an omnipotent Governor of the universe. (2) The second thought is, that, although none of these arguments (except the moral argument) is by itself valid and convincing, each one contains elements, the combination of which makes the divine existence very probable, if not necessary for the mind. Professor Diman (Theistic Argument, p. 247) has put the case well in the following language: "The argument for the divine existence is complex and correlative. Not from one, but from many sources is the evidence derived; and its force lies in the whole, not in any of its parts."

Lit. Sources. Saint Anselm (Monologium and Proslogium), Thomas Aquinas, Descartes (Meditations), Leibnitz, Samuel Clarke (A Discourse concerning the Being and Attributes of God, London, 1704), Kant (Kritik d. praktischen Vernunft), etc. On the Whole Subject.—Tyzeca: Gesch. d. Beweise für d. Dasein Gottes bis zum 17ten Jahrhundert, 1875; Krebs: Gesch. d. Beweise für d. Dasein Gottes von Cartesius bis Kant, 1876.
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II. ATTRIBUTES.—The attributes or properties of God are the modes in which we conceive of his nature. The distinction aids our finite minds in their attempts to understand God. But the attributes do not exist apart and separate from one another. Each is in itself the being of God, and identical with it. Three methods, mentioned for the first time by Dionysius the Areopagite, may be pursued to rise to a determination of the attributes; viz., denying to God all human imperfections (via negationis), affirming of all proper human qualities in their ultimate perfection (via eminence), attributing to him all properties logically belonging to a First Cause (via causallatitas). Various classifications of the attributes have been made into positive and negative, natural and moral, absolute and relative, immanent and emanant, etc. An excellent summary is found in the definition of God in the Westminster Shorter Catechism: “God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth.” They may be enumerated here as follows:

1. ASGENCY. God has life in himself, underived and inexhaustible (John vi. 26). 2. INVISIBILITY. God is Spirit (John iv. 24). No man hath seen God (John i. 18). His nature is immaterial. 3. ETERNITY, or God’s infinity with regard to duration. He always has been, always will be (Ps. xc. 2; 1 Tim. i. 17, etc.). 4. IMMUTABILITY. He changes not, in his nature (it does not grow or decrease), or in his purpose (Mal. iii. 6; Jas. i. 17). 5. OMNIPRESENCE. God is everywhere,—in heaven in a special manner, in hell, on earth, in the inanimate as well as the rational worlds (Ps. cxlii. 7; Isa. i. 15, etc.). 6. OMNISCIENCE. God is cognizant of all things. This knowledge is accurate and present (Matt. vi. 32). 7. WISDOM. God realizes the best designs by the use of the best means (Rom. xi. 33). It is manifest in the kingdoms of nature and grace. 8. OMNIPOTENCE. God has infinite power, and can do all things according to his will. He cannot deny himself by acting contrary to the laws of his own being. But in the truest sense nothing is impossible to God (Ps. xcv. 3; Matt. xix. 26). 9. HOLINESS. God is absolute and stainless morally pure. Not only is sinning to him impossible, but also the toleration of sin (Deut. xxxiii. 4; Hab. i. 13; 1 John i. 5). For this reason, God is absolutely reliable. 10. JUSTICE. God demands of his creatures righteous action, and deals righteously toward them, according to the canons which he has laid down for the race. It is legislative, as implanting a moral nature and law, and judicial, as punishing the wicked (Rom. i. 32) and rewarding the good (Rom. ii. 7). 11. LOVE (1 John iv. 8). This is God’s chiefest attribute, all the others being exercised in accordance with its dictates. It manifests itself as goodness toward all creation (Jas. i. 17), unmerited grace toward the sinner (Rom. iii. 24), mercy toward the suffering (2 Cor. i. 3), and long-suffering toward those who resist the calls of the Spirit (Rom. ii. 4). 12. FAITHFULNESS. God is absolutely reliable. His words and promises will not fail (Num. xxxiii. 19; Tit. i. 2).

CURTIS.—The attributes or proper

GODFREY OF BOUILLON.

GODEAU, Antoîne, Bishop of Grasse (1630), and then of Vence; b. at Dreux, 1605; d. at Vence, April 21, 1672. He was a man of literary tastes and poetical gifts. Among his works were, Version expression (2 vols.), Le psaumes de David, traduits en vers français (some of which are sung in French Protestant churches). Historie de l’Eglise depuis le commencement du monde jusqu’à la fin du neuvième siècle (Paris, 1653-78). The last work is written in a more vivacious style than Fleury’s, but less exact.

GODEHARD, St., b. at Ritenbach, Bavaria, 961; d. at Hildesheim, May 5, 1088; was educated at the court of the Archbishop of Salzburg, but entered the monastery of Nieder-Altaich in 991, and became its abbot in 997. By Henry II. he was charged with reforming the monasteries of Hersfeld, Tegernsee, etc., and, having succeeded in this task, he made Bishop of Hildesheim in 1022. As a bishop he developed a great building activity. He was also credited with having worked miracles; and in 1131 he was canonized by Innocent III. His life was written by a contemporary, Wolhere. See LKBINZT: Script. Rerum Brunscie. I. 482, and Act. Sanct., Maji, Tom. I.

GODFREY OF BOUILLON (Duke of Lower Lorraine, and King of Jerusalem), the beloved leader of the first crusade; b. at Bayeux, in Normandy, about 1000; d. in Jerusalem, July 15 or 18, 1100. He took the cross 1095, pawned his lordship of Bouillon to the church of Liege for thirteen hundred marks, collected eighty thousand infantry and ten thousand horsemen, and, after many adventures, arrived with the crusaders at Jerusalem, and took it, after a five-weeks’ siege, July 15, 1099. “A Christian kingdom of Jerusalem was then founded, of which Godfrey was unanimously elected sovereign; but he refused to wear a crown of gold where his Lord had worn a crown of thorns, and accepted, instead of the kingly title, the humbler designation of ‘Defender
and Baron of the Holy Sepulchre.” His reign was very brief (only a single year), but full of brave deeds. He died lamented by both his Mohammedan and Christian subjects. Tasso has immortalized him in his Jerusalem Delivered; and history confirms his description of Godfrey as a pious, accomplished, and prudent knight. The only blot upon his record was his massacre of the Mohammedan defenders of Jerusalem; but even that is not inexcusable in view of the usages of the times and the circumstances of the siege.

**GODWIN, Francis, Bishop of Llandaff, and church historian:** b. 1581, at Haviington, Northamptonshire; d. April, 1633. He was the son of Thomas (d. 1590), Bishop of Bath and Wells, who fell into disgrace for marrying a second time. He studied at Christ Church, Oxford. His work, *A Catalogue of the Bishops of England since the first planting of the Christian religion in this island* (published 1601), secured for him a bishopric. *Rerum Anglic. Henrico VIII., Edwardo VI., et Maria regnantibus, Annales*, appeared 1616, and the posthumous work, *The Mon. in the Mo.* 1638, in which he advocates the Copernican system.

**GODWIN, Thomas, a learned antiquarian:** b. in Somersetshire, 1587; educated at Oxford; d. 1643. His work, *Moses & Aaron; or the civil & ecclesiastical Rites used by the Ancient Hebrews, etc.*, Oxford, 1618 (12th ed., 1655), was a celebrated book for a century.

**GOEPP, Jean Jacques,** b. at Heiligenstein, Alsace, April 8, 1771; d. in Paris, June 21, 1855; studied at Strassburg; made a campaign in the republican army; and was appointed pastor of the French Protestant Congregation in Strassburg in 1802, and of the Lutheran Congregation in Paris in 1809. In Paris he developed a great and beneficial activity, gathering and organizing the Lutherans living in the city, establishing schools for their children, asylums and mutual insurance associations for their poor, a mission society, a Bible society, etc. He published a volume of sermons, and various pamphlets on special occasions.

**GOERRES, Johann Joseph,** b. at Coblenz, Jan. 25, 1776; d. at Munich, Jan. 27, 1848; one of the most conspicuous names in modern German literature, and, if not a man of great influence, at all events a character of much significance. He was an enthusiast. His first enthusiasm was the French Revolution. Hardly out of school, he established a paper (Das rothe Blatt) preaching liberty, equality, republicanism, and radicalism of the deepest dye. The paper was soon interdicted; but he immediately established another (Rubezahl im Blauen Gewande), which also was interdicted. In 1790 he went to Paris on a political mission to the Directory; but the sight of Napoleon, who had just returned from Egypt, and overthrown the Directory, fell like a chill on his enthusiasm. He gave up politics, and returned to his studies. His second enthusiasm was the philosophy of Schelling, at that time rising in its first flush of success. He wrote on every thing—art, faith, and reason, physiology, mythology, etc.—and always brilliantly. But it proved easier to make a sensation than to get followers: his attempts to make a university career failed. His third enthusiasm was the liberation of the slaves of the English. In 1839 he returned to politics, and published the *Rheinischer Merkur,* a paper whose leading idea is nationality rather than liberty, and which contains the soundest thoughts and most powerful expositions he ever produced. He died, February 15, 1855, hailed it as the “fifth grand power.” But it was interdicted in 1816 by a Prussian cabinet-order; and when, in 1820, his *Deutschland und die Revolution* was followed by another Prussian cabinet-order, this time for his arrest, he fled to Strassburg, despairing of ever seeing the world of literature again. His fourth and last enthusiasm was the Roman-Catholic Church. He had always been a member of the Romantic school; and he now became the leader of the extreme left wing of that school,—those who were marching straightway to Rome. But he wrote with the same enthusiasm for this ghost of the past as he had formerly written for the ideals of the future. In 1827 he was appointed professor of history in Munich; and there he published, both large scientific works (Geschichte der christlichen Mystik, 1836—42, 4 vols.), and small polemical articles for the occasion, in Historisch-politische Blatter (1838). He was, indeed, the literary champion of Ultramontanism in Germany; but as literature is no fit weapon for Ultramontanism, as Ultramontanism likes best to avoid literature, with its arguments and its publicity, he could not help feeling that he was merely writing on running water.

**GOESCHEL, Karl Friedrich,** b. at Langensalza, Oct. 7, 1784; d. at Naumburg, Sept. 22, 1861; was educated at Gotha; studied law at Leipzig; held appointments, first in the superior court of Naumburg (1810—34), then in the Department of the Interior in Berlin (1834—47), and was in 1845 made president of the consistory of the province of Saxony, with residence in Magdeburg, from which position he was forced to retire by the revolution (1848). He was a very prolific writer, and published about thirty volumes, besides about three hundred articles in periodicals. His great object was to work out a reconciliation between Christianity and modern culture as represented philosophically by Hegel, and poetically by Goethe, and to that end tend his principal works: Unterhaltungen zur Schilderung Göschers Dich- und Denk-weise, Leipzig, 1834—36, 3 vols.; Uber Nichts- wissen und absolutes Wissen, 1829 (referring to Hegel as the former to Goethe); and Zerstreute Blätter aus den Hand- und Hülfs-acten eines Juristen, 1832—42, 4 vols. (relating to modern jurisprudence).

**GOEZE, Johan Melchior,** b. at Halberstadt, Oct. 16, 1717; d. at Hamburg, May 18, 1758; studied at Halé, and was made pastor of the Church of the Holy Spirit at Magdeburg, 1750, and of the Church of St. Catharine in Hamburg, 1755. In 1777 he attacked Lessing on account of the publication of the Wolfenbüttel Fragments, and, of the many challengers who rose against him, Lessing selected Goeze because he considered him the most important
and the most dangerous. Goze opened the controversy with an essay in the Freywilligen Beytrage, Dec. 17, 1777; then followed, in 1778, Etzcas Vor- läufiges gegen d. Herrn Hofrath Lessing, and Lessings Schidichen, in three parts. Lessing published in all eighteen pieces against Goze, which are found in the collected editions of his works. See Röve: J. M. Goze, eine Rettung, Hamburg, 1800; and A. Boden: Lessons and Goze, Leipzig, 1862.

GOG AND MAGOG. In Gen. x. 2 the second son of Japhet is called Magog, i.e., the name of a people living between Armenia and Media, somewhere on the shores of the Araxes. Ezek. xxxviii. and xxxix. is a prophecy against Gog, who is the king of the land of Magog, which evidently was then much farther north, across the Caucasus. Ezekiel's description of the inroad of Gog reminds us of that of the Scythians (B.C. 630), which had the same characteristics (cf. Herod., 1. 108 sqq.), and probably the Scythians were in his mind or he had at the prophet; but they are not really described. Rather by Gog, King of Magog, is meant the leader of the movement of the great world-power against the kingdom of God,—the attack mentioned by other prophets of Israel (Ezek. xxxviii. 17), especially by Joel (iii. 9 sqq.), Micah (iv. 11 sqq.), Zachariah (xii. 2 sqq., xiv.). But the sentence of condemnation is already spoken, and the world-power is to be overthrown. The interpretation of this prophecy is simple. The overthrow of Magog has nothing to do with the overthrow of the Chaldeans: rather it means, that, after judgment has fallen upon all those peoples brought into contact with the Jews, there will be left a remnant from whom will come the impulse upon the world-power to incite it to oppose the kingdom, and by so doing to seal its own fate. In the Revelation (xx. 7 sqq.) Gog and Magog appear as two peoples, and, as in Ezekiel, are similarly overthrown. The names are also separated in Jewish theology (Targum to Num. xi. 27) and among the Mohammedans (Koran, 18, 93). v. Orell.

The legendary interest in Gog and Magog is considerable. Thus in Astrakhan the story is told, that Alexander the Great overthrew these two great peoples, and drove them into the recesses of the Caucasus, where they are now in terror, because of the noise of twelve trumpets blown by the winds. But out of their captivity they are sure to come, and devastate the world. In Guild Hall, London, there are two effigies, fourteen feet high, of Gog and Magog, who, according to the legend, were the sole survivors of the race of giants descended from Diodocian's thirty-three bad daughters which Brute destroyed. These two were brought by him to London, and made porters at the royal palace's gate; and, when they died, their effigies took their place. The present figures were made in 1708; but similar ones can be proven to have existed as early as 1415, and probably much before. Geoffrey of Monmouth tells (Chron., i. 16) of a giant eighteen feet high, called Golamogot (a corruption of Gog and Magog), who with his brother Corimeus, was the terror of Cornwall. See art. Gog and Magog, in Encyc. Brit., 9th ed., and Brewer's Reader's Handbook.

Gogerley, Daniel John, a Wesleyan missionary, b. in London, August, 1792; d. Sept. 6, 1862.

In 1818 he was sent to Ceylon to take charge of the Wesleyan mission press at Colombo; and by devoting his great talents to Pali, the sacred language of the Buddhists, he achieved an acknowledged mastership. He was the author, in large part, of the Cingalese version of the Scriptures, published by the British and Foreign Bible Society, and in that dialect issued Christiani Fraggnapti (Colombo, 1822), a treatise upon the evidences and doctrines of the Christian religion. Many of his studies appeared in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, of the Ceylon branch of which society he was the vice-president.

GOLDEN CALF. See Calf.

GOLDEN LEGEND (Legenda Aurea), a collection of legends of saints, without historical value, but very popular. It was compiled by the Dominican Jacobus de Voragine, in the thirteenth century, first edition, with date, but without place, 1474, seventy-one editions before 1600, new edition by Th. Greasse, Dresden, 1846. The book has great value for the student of middle-age superstition. See Jacobs de Voragine, and Legend.

GOLDEN NUMBER, the place of a given year in the lunar cycle, which cycle is equal to nineteen Julian years. The golden numbers were introduced into the calendar about 530, but arranged as if they had been introduced in 326 (the Council of Nicea). They were usually marked in red or gold. But they are rejected from the Gregorian Calendar, as they fit only the Julian.

GOLDEN ROSE is made of wrought gold, and set with gems, blessed by the Pope on the fourth Sunday of Lent, and sent by him, as a token of his special regard, to some person, church, or community: if not sent, it is preserved in the Vatican. The first mention of the "rose" occurs in the eleventh century. Pope Urban V. decreed one should be sent every year. Among the recipients of this favor have been Joanna of Naples, Henry VIII. of England, Gonsalvo de Cordova, Napoleon III., Isabella II., Stephanie, Crown Princess of Austria (1882).

GOLGOtha. See Holy SEPULCHRE.

Gomarus, Francis, b. at Bruges, Jan. 30, 1563; d. at Groningen, Jan. 11, 1641; studied at Strasbourg, Neustadt, Cambridge, Oxford, and Heidelberg, and was in 1587 appointed pastor to the Flemish congregation at Franfort. In 1604 he was called to Leyden as professor of divinity, but resigned this position in 1611, because Vorstius was made the successor of Arminius. In 1614 he accepted an invitation to Saumur as professor of theology, and in 1618 he removed to Groningen. He was the leader of the severe Calvinistic party, and the declared adversary of Arminianism, which he opposed with virulence and intolerance, and finally caused to be condemned at the synod of Dort, 1618. His collected works, mostly polemical, appeared in one volume fol., in Amsterdam, 1645. See the art. ARMINIANISM.

Gomer (up. Sept. תֹּום) is, in Gen. x. 2 and 1 Chron. i. 5, the name of the first-born son of Japheth. In Ezek. xxxviii. 6 it designates, together with Togarmah, a northern tribe, which, in alliance with Magog, fought the last battle against Israel.
The question, What nation or race is meant by this designation? has been differently answered at various times. Josephus (Antiq., I. 6, 1) derives the Galatians from Gomer; and a gloss on Syriacus reads Poqo, lit. in the Targums, on the contrary (Jonath. and Jerus.), on Gen. x. 2, in the Targum on 1 Chron. i. 5, as well as in Brehisth. R., Gomer is explained by מומיי ("Germania"), or מומיי and מומיי ("Africa"). As the ancestor of the Germanic race, the Targums specially designate the third son of Gomer, Togarmah; though later Jews also mention the first-born son, Ashkenaz. Africa—for מומיי can hardly be explained by Phrygia, or some obscure place—they probably stumbled upon, because at one time a Germanic tribe, the Vandals, were settled there. Earlier Christian exegetes, as, for instance, Jerome, Nicholas of Lyra, and others, generally adopted the views of Josephus. Luther, however, arguing from Ezek. xxxviii. 6 and the striking similarity of names, explained Gomer by Cimmerians; and through Arias Montanus, J. A. Osiander (who identifies the Cimmerians with the Cimbrians), Calmet, and others, this view spread widely.

Which of these different interpretations is the true one is perhaps not so very difficult to decide. In spite of their various discrepancies, they all agree in the one point,—that Gomer designates a people native of Europe, living in the far-off north, and thence penetrating towards the south, even into Asia; and, if this the fundamental wish to give a biblical origin and significance to the historical stage. How curiously historical north, and thence penetrating towards the south, each other (Diod. Sic., 5, 32; Isid. Hispan., one a continuation or revival of the other: in view of Luther's completely at variance with that events often affect ethnographical interpretations exegetes, as, for instance, Jerome, Nicholas of Lyra, and others, generally adopted the views of Josephus. Luther, however, arguing from Ezek. xxxviii. 6 and the striking similarity of names, explained Gomer by Cimmerians; and through Arias Montanus, J. A. Osiander (who identifies the Cimmerians with the Cimbrians), Calmet, and others, this view spread widely.

In spite of their various discrepancies, they all agree in the one point,—that Gomer designates a people native of Europe, living in the far-off north, and thence penetrating towards the south, even into Asia; and, if this the fundamental view is correct, the interpretation which explains Gomer by Cimmerians is the best. Nor is the view of Luther so completely at variance with that of Josephus. The Gauls, or Galatians, who, in the third century B.C., invaded, first Thracia and Greece, and then Asia Minor, resembled the Cimmerians so much on account of their European origin, wide-sweeping campaigns, and terrible savagery (Livy, 38, 37; 1 Macc. viii. 2; 2 Macc. viii. 20), that it was quite natural to consider the one a continuation or revival of the other: indeed, the two peoples were often identified with each other (Diod. Sic., 5, 32; Isid. Hispan., Etym., 9, 2, 26; Zonaras, Ann., 1, 5). That the above-mentioned Targums preferred to explain Gomer by Germania was the result of a simple wish to give a biblical origin and significance to this powerful race as soon as it had fairly entered the historical stage. How curiously historical events often affect ethnographical interpretations may be seen, for instance, from the explanation of Magog in the time of Jerome, as identical with the Goths.

FR. W. SCHULTZ.

GOMOR'RAH. See Sod'om.

GON'UDLUF, b. near Rouen, 1023; d. at Rochester, 1108; became a monk in the monastery of Bec, 1069; accompanied Lanfranc to Caen, 1063, and to Canterbury, 1070, and became Bishop of Rochester 1077. He played an important part in the controversy between Lanfranc and William Rufus and Henry 1; but of his letters only two have been preserved. See his life in Wharton: Anglia Sacra.

GON'ESIUS, Petrus, b. at Goniadz, 1525; began his public career in Krakau as a zealous adherent of the Roman Church, and was by the bishop and clergy of Samogitia sent to foreign countries for his further education, but returned from his visits to Wittenberg and Geneva, and from his study of the works of Servetus and the Moravian Anabaptist, not only a Protestant, but a champion of Antitrinitarian and Anabaptist views. He was condemned by the councils of Secemin (1556) and Brzesk (1558), but continued to labor for his ideas. Nevertheless, when a split actually took place in the Reformed Church of Poland (1565), between a Trinitarian and Unitarian party, Gonesius was not able to come to a thorough understanding with the latter. Of the later part of his life nothing is known.


GOOD FRIDAY, the anniversary of our Lord's passion and death. In the early Church it was also known as the "Festival of the Crucifixion" πασχα σταυρωσιον, the "Day of Salvation," etc. Its observance must date back to the earliest period of the Church. The early Church kept it as a rigorous fast and period of mourning; for, although the crucifixion was the last atoning act of Christ's life, yet it brought him down to the Saviour, and removed him, for a time, from the disappointed disciples. The public services were conducted with deep solemnity and with the outward signs of sorrow. Constantine the Great (Euseb., Vita, I. 4) forbade the holding of judicial trials, markets, etc., on the day. In Spain they went so far as to close the churches, a procedure which the Council of Toledo (633) condemned. At the present day the Greek and Latin churches celebrate Good Friday with as strict severity as they do Easter with glad jubilation. The bells on the church-towers are silent, the light on the altars is extinguished, the altar furniture covered with black, and the usual communion omitted, the priest alone communicating. See EASTER.

GOODELL, William, D.D., eminent missionary of the American Board; b. at Templeton, Mass., Feb. 14, 1792; d. in Philadelphia, Monday, Feb. 18, 1867. He was graduated at Dartmouth College, 1817, and at Andover Theological Seminary, 1820. Already in 1818 he had determined to become a foreign missionary: so after graduation, he studied medicine for a while, and then spent a year in visiting the churches as agent of the American Board. He sailed for Beyrout, Dec. 9, 1822, where he arrived Nov. 18, 1823, having stopped for several months at Malta. He expected to proceed thence to Jerusalem; but the disturbed state of the country, in consequence of the Greek Revolution, prevented him. Finally (1828) all the missionaries in Beyrout were compelled to leave Syria, owing to the withdrawal of all consular protection, and went to Malta. In 1831 he received instructions from the Board to begin a new mission to the Armenians at Constantinople, and there arrived June 9; and until 1865 he labored with fidelity, enthusiasm, and success. He was rarely gifted, full of genial humor, simple, courageous, modest, above all, holy. He won hearts, and moulded lives. One of his most important labors was the translation of the Bible into Armeno-Turkish, which was begun in Syria; the New Testament finished Jan. 5, 1860, and the Old Testament, Nov. 8, 1841. See E. D. G. PRIME: Forty Years in the Turkish Em.
GOODWIN.

GOODWIN, Charles Wycliffe, linguist; b. at

GOODWIN, John, an able Arminian divine

GOODWIN, Thomas D.D., a "Patriarch and

GORTON, Samuel, b. at Groton, Eng., about

GORTON CASE, a case involving the tenets

GORHAM, an Armenian scholar from the fifth
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GORIAN CASE, a case involving the tenets

GORIAN, an Armenian scholar from the fifth
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GORTON, Samuel, b. at Groton, Eng., about

GORTON, Samuel, b. at Groton, Eng., about
GOSHEN.

went to England, and returned (1848) with an order from the Earl of Warwick to the Massachusetts magistrates, that the Shawomet Colony should be removed. In 1645, the years of Gorton's life were peaceful. He named the Colony Warwick, out of gratitude to the earl. His sect, which quickly died out, was called the "Gortonians." Their belief has been thus given: "They contemned a clergy and all outward forms, held that by union with Christ believers partook of the perfection of God, that Christ is both human and divine, and that heaven and hell have no existence save in the mind." See Gorton's "Simplicities Defence against seven-headed Policy" (1840), reprinted in Rhode Island Historical Collections (1880), and in Force's "Tracts" (1846), vol. iv. no. 6; and Answer concerning Part of "New England's Memorial," reprinted in Force's "Tracts" (1846), vol. iv. no. 7; also J. M. Mackie: Life of Samuel Gorton, Boston, 1848.

GOSHEN. See Egypt.

GOSPEL and GOSPELS. I. MEANING OF THE WORD.—Gospel (Anglo-Saxon, "god-spell," "good spell," from spellan, "to tell") is the English equivalent for the Greek εὐαγγέλιον (from εὐ, "well," and ἀγγέλλω, "to bear message," ἀγγέλω, "to announce good news"), and the Latin evangelium, which has passed into French, German, Italian, and other modern languages. The Greek means (1) Reward for good news, given to the messenger, or to God, a thank-offering or sacrifice (so in Homer, Xenophon, Plutarch, etc.), but always in the plural, εὐαγγέλια; (2) Good news, or glad tidings of any kind; (3) In the Christian sense, as used in the New Testament, this salvation, or of the life, death, and resurrection of Christ, or the gospel history, which we have in a fourfold form.

II. KINDS OF GOSPELS.—(1) Four Canonical Gospels, written by apostles and apostolic men, and recognized by the Christian Church as authentic and reliable. (2) A large number of Apocryphal Gospels, of later and obscure origin, and rejected as mere fictions. They serve, however, the good purpose of confirming the truth of the Canonical Gospels, and show, by their infinite inferiority and silliness, the utter incapacity of the human imagination to produce such a character as Jesus of Nazareth. They are counterfeits and caricatures of the inimitable original. See Apocrypha of the New Testament. We confine ourselves here to the Canonical Gospels.

III. GENERAL CHARACTER OF THE GOSPELS.—They are beyond all question the most important and the most popular books ever written. They contain the only authentic record of the history of all histories, which interests the whole world, and can never grow old. The very opposition to them, and the immense and ever-growing literary interest in them that has produced the entire power and charm. And yet they were written by humble and unlearned fishermen of Galilee, but they were in the school of Christ, and filled with his Spirit. This, and this alone, explains the mystery. Without the miracle of Christ's person, the fourfold Gospel would be nothing more than an account of all miracles. They are properly only one and the same Gospel in its fourfold aspect and relation to the human race ("the fourfold Gospel," πτέρυγανος εὐαγγέλιον, according to Irenaeus): hence they are styled in ancient manuscripts the Gospel of according to (not of) the human race ("the fourfold Gospel," πτέρυγανος εὐαγγέλιον, according to Irenaeus): hence they are styled in ancient manuscripts the Gospel of."
all literary compositions, the Gospel of Gospels, "the one, true, tender, main Gospel," "the heart of Christ." Yet the first three are just as necessary, and give the historical basis, the divine humanity of Christ; while John, going back to the eternal Logos, presents to us the incarnate divinity of Christ. The poetry and pictorial art of the Church (since the time of Irenæus and Jerome) has represented the four Gospels under the four figures of Ezekiel (i. 15, x. 1, xi. 22), and the four living creatures (Zoe) of the Apocalypse (iv. 4–9, etc.), which reflect the Divine majesty and strength in the animal creation. To Matthew is assigned the figure of a man; to Mark, the lion; to Luke, the sacrificial ox; to John, the soaring eagle. Adam of St. Victor, the greatest Latin poet of the middle ages, has devoted two of his finest poems to this subject. His description of John is very musical and striking: —

"Volat avis sine meta
Quo nec vates, nec prophetarum
Tam implenda quam impleta,
Numquam vidit tot secretae
Purus homo purus."

V. CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPELS. — They make upon every unsophisticated reader the impression of absolute honesty and trustworthiness. They cannot possibly be the mythical or legendary production of a pious fancy (as Strauss and Renan would fain make us believe), or of a calculating adaptation to certain religious tendencies (Baur and the Tubingen school). It would take more than a Jesus to invent a Jesus. The evangelists tell with the utmost frankness and simplicity the story of Christ, without note or comment, without mentioning their name, without concealment of the errors and failings of the disciples (themselves included), even the denial of their leader, and the treason of Judas. The discrepancies in details only heighten the credibility, and exclude the suspicion of collusion and conspiracy. They show the independence of their witness to the essential facts. The genuineness and truthfulness of these books rest on stronger evidence than that of any other historical records, ancient or modern. This has been acknowledged by eminent writers who are free from all doctrinal or sectarian bias. Goethe says, "I regard the Gospels as thoroughly genuine; for we see in them the reflection of a majesty which proceeded from the person of Christ,—a majesty which is as divine an any thing that ever appeared on earth." Rousseau remarks that "the gospel history can be no fiction, else the inventor would be greater than the hero" (l'inventeur en serait plus étonnant que le héros). And yet the Jesus of the Gospels is admitted by all competent judges to be the purest character conceivable. If there is no truth and reality in him, it is nowhere to be found. Take away the historical Christ, the Life and Light of the world, and history is as dark as midnight; but with him it is a revelation of the infinite wisdom and love of God in the salvation of mankind. — For particulars, see arts. HARMONY, SYNOPSIS, MATTHEW, MARK, LUKE, and JOHN.

VI. LIT. — This has immensely increased in the last thirty years, in connection with the numerous Lives of Jesus, e.g., by Strauss, Keim, Weiss, Eversheim; see list under art. JESUS CHRIST. We mention here:

(1) the critical introductions to the New Testament, by De Wette, Bleek, Davidson (2d ed., 1882), Reuss (5th ed., 1874), Hilgenfeld (1875).

(2) The general commentaries on the Gospels, by Olshausen, De Wette, Meyer, Lange, Naß, Kell, Alford, Wordsworth, also the Speaker's (with an appendix on the four cherubim figures) by Archbishop Thomson (1878), and those by Ellcott, Schiff (International Revision Commentary, 1882).


(4) Critical discussions on the origin, genuineness, and inter-relationship of the Gospels began with Eichhorn, Marsh, and Schleiermacher, and were carried on chiefly by Gieseler, Beza, Hilgenfeld, Holtmann, Ewald, Renan (Les Evangiles, 1877), Bleek, Wieseler, Ebrard, Weiss, Weizäcker, the anonymous author of Supernatural Religion, reviewed and refuted by Lightfoot (in the Contemporary Review, 1876 sqq.).


PHILIP SCHAPP.

GOSPELIER, the word was formerly used in four senses: (1) Of the followers of Wiclif, because they circulated the Scriptures; (2) Of evangelists; (3) Of the reader of the gospel at the altar during the communion service; (4) Of those in the sixteenth century, in the Church of England, who were given to Bible reading and preaching. These last, it would seem from the remarks of Latimer and Cranmer, were not always so pious as they pretended to be.

GOSSNER, Johannes Evangelista, b. at Hau-
in the latter part of the fourth century, a great portion of the Visigoths, pushed beyond the Danube by the advancing Huns, came to settle within the boundaries of the Eastern Empire, combined with the Orthodox Church. The Emperor Theodosius (379-395) seems to have treated the matter with great delicacy. But his exertions to bring the Goths over to the Orthodox Church failed, and so did those of Chrysostom. Immediately after the death of Theodosius the Visigoths arose, and began to wander. Under the leadership of Alaric they invaded Greece in 395, and took and sacked Athens. In 402 they broke into Italy, and in 410 they took and sacked Rome. But it was Paganism, and not Christianity, which suffered under this calamity. The Pagan inhabitants were scattered to the winds; while the Christians remained, and even enriched themselves by appropriating the Pagan temples, and transforming them into Christian churches. Alaric's son, Athaulf, married Placidia, sister to the Emperor Honorius, left Italy, and founded in Southern Gaul a Gothic empire, with Toulouse as his residence. Of the rulers of this empire Theodoric I., fought by the side of the Roman governor of Gaul, Aëtius, on the Catalanian field (511), against Attila; and Theodoric II., invaded and conquered Spain (486). In the beginning the Arian Goths lived peaceably among the orthodox Romans and Romanized Celts in Gaul; but when their king, Euric (466-483), instituted persecutions, partly from religious and partly from political reasons, the orthodox made an alliance with the Frankish king, Clovis, who defeated the Goths at Vouglé, near Poitiers (507), and drove them beyond the Pyrenees. In Spain the Gothic Empire flourished until overthrown by the Saracens after the battle of Xeres de la Frontera (711). But in Spain the Goths were converted. At the Council of Toledo (581), the Arians under the king, Leo-vigil, and the Catholics under their metropolitan, Leander, met together, and a grand disputation was held, the result of which was, that, at the next Council of Toledo (589), King Recared and most of his Gothic subjects abjured Arianism. Meanwhile the Ostrogoths had first followed Attila, and fought with him against Aëtius and Theodoric; then, after Attila's death, they separated from the Huns, and settled in Pannonia; and finally, under their great king, Theodoric (475-526), they conquered Illyria and Thessalia from the Eastern Empire, defeated Odoacer several times in Northern Italy, captured Rome, and formed a great empire, bounded north-west and north by the Rhone and the Danube, and with Ravenna for its capital. The Ostrogoths were also Arians; but Theodoric's relations with the Catholic Church in Italy were most friendly. He protected and enriched it, which, perhaps, was due to the influence of his counsellor, Cassiodorus. Only when the East-Roman emperor, Justin, issued edicts against the Arians among his subjects, and even raised persecutions against them, Theodoric was provoked, not to retaliation, but to a kind of self-defence. He sent the Bishop of Rome, John, to Constantinople, and, as this had no result, he felt sure of his position; and the Pope was imprisoned, and the senators Symmachus, Albinus, and Boethius were beheaded. But Theodoric died the very next year, and...
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with his death began immediately the dissolution of the Ostrogothic Empire. During the next twenty-six years, or until the defeat of Tejas by Narses (552), the religious questions were completely at rest; and, with the death of Tejas, not only the Ostrogothic Empire, but the Ostrogoths themselves, disappeared from history.

But Gottschalk was finally defeated by Duke Bernard of Saxony, and taken prisoner, and in his captivity he returned to Christianity. After a stay of ten years at the court of Canute the Great, King of Denmark and England, he went back to Wendland, and by the aid of Canute he united (1047) Holstein, Mecklenburg, Pomerania, and the Brandenburg-Prussian provinces into one powerful Wendish empire. He became himself one of the most zealous missionaries Christianity ever had had in those regions. He translated the liturgical formulas into the Wendish tongue; he built schools, churches, and monasteries; and he preached himself to his subjects. But there was among the Wends an actual hatred to Christianity. It broke out once more; and June 7, 1066, Gottschalk was murdered by his Pagan countrymen.


GOUZE, Thomas, son of William; b. at Bow, Middlesex, Sept. 1, 1605; d. at London, Oct. 29, 1681. He was a fellow of King's College, Cambridge; obtained the living of St. Sepulchre's, London; was ejected at the Restoration for non-conformity (1662), after which time he devoted himself to charitable enterprises. He was particularly interested in evangelization and education in Wales, and travelled annually thither to preach, and visit the schools. Aided by friends, he had printed many Welsh Bibles and religious books for out his poor was burnt, and he himself was cruelly whipped, and then shut up half dead in the dungeon of the monastery of Hauvilliers. He remained, however, firm to the last. On his death-bed (1685) the sacrament was offered him on the condition that he should recant; but he refused.

the oracle of his time." In his early ministry he was brought into trouble with King James and the government by his publication of Henry Finch on The Calling of the Jews (1621), and was thrown into prison. After nine weeks he was released, having given a statement of his own opinions, which were entirely orthodox. He took his degree of doctor of divinity in 1628. Several volumes of his sermons were issued, The Whole Armour of God (1618, 4to, pp. 220), Domestic Duties (1622, 3d ed., 1634, 4to, pp. 704), Guide to God (1629, 4to, pp. 340), God's Three Arrows (1631, pp. 176), The Saint's Sacrifice (1632, pp. 290), and others. He was also distinguished for his method of catechising, which was first published without his knowledge, but afterwards revised and edited by himself in many editions; the eighth volumes of his sermons were issued, The Whole Armour of God (1637, 4to) containing a finger and lesser catechism, with prayers. In 1643 he was made a member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, and took an active part in their proceedings, in 1647, taking the place of Herbert Palmer, lately deceased, as one of the assessors. He was on the committee for the revision of the scriptures, and the minutes of the Assembly were chosen with others to write the Assembly's Annotations on the Bible, his part being from 1 Kings to Job. He assisted in the preparation of the Westminster Confession of Faith and in the conflict with the separatists of the day. He was chosen prolocutor of the first Provincial Assembly of London, May 3, 1647, and was a recognized leader of the London ministers, uniting with them in protesting against the murder of Charles I. His Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, which he rarely lived to finish, and which was published after his death, by his son, in 1655 (2 vols. folio).—a very able and useful work of exposition, and of permanent value to the Church. For further information, see his Life by his son, in the Introduction to the folio edition of the Commentary on Hebrews: also in CLARK'S Lives of Westminster Divines, 1811; BROOK: Lives of Puritans, vol. III. p. 165. C. A. BRIGGS.

GOULART, Simon, b. at Senlis, 1543; d. at Geneva, 1628; was pastor, and, after the death of Beza, president of the clergy of Geneva. He was a learned man and a prolific writer, though most of his works (of which a list is given in Sénébier, Histoire littéraire de Genève, II. 72) are collections: as, for instance, Mémoires de la Ligne, Geneva, 1590—99, 6 vols., re-edited and augmented by Goujet, Amsterdam, 1756; Recueil des choses les plus curieuses sous Henri II., 1583, etc.

GOVINDA. See Stinus.

GO'ZAN (Heb. גזון; Asyr. Gu-za-na; LXX. Γοζᾶν) is mentioned in the following passages of the Old Testament: 2 Kings xvii. 6, xviii. 11, xix. 12 (= Isa. xxxvii. 12); 1 Chron. v. 26. From these we learn that it was a place which Assyrian kings had subjugated, and that by the "river of Gozan" (= the Habor; Assy. Habur) the conqueror of Samaria (Sargon), and Tiglath Pileser, or Pul, before him, had made settlements of Israelitish captives. The cuneiform inscriptions locate Gozan between the Tigris and the Euphrates. It is probable that the Habor, a large eastern tributary of the Euphrates and its mention (2 Kings xix. 12; Isa. xxxvii. 12) in connection with the Mesopotamian names Haran, Rezeph, and Bne Eden, are additional proofs of this location. Gozan was originally the name of a city, and always appears with the prefix "city" in the inscriptions: later the name seems to have been applied to a district. It is in all likelihood the Gagan of Ptolemy (Geogr., V. 17 (18), ed. Wilberg.), lying in Northern Mesopotamia.


GRAAL, The Holy (also called "St. Grail," "Sangreal," etc., and incorrectly spelled "Grail"), is the name of the bowl out of which our Lord, on the night of his betrayal, ate the Paschal lamb. It was removed from the upper room by Joseph of Arimathea, and used by him to catch the blood from Christ's wounds as the body was taken down from the cross. Joseph carried it with him to Britain, whither he was sent by Philip the Evangelist. The Holy Grail figures largely in the Arthurian legends, and is the subject of Tennyson's idylls. It had miraculous qualities. By it Joseph was kept alive, without food, for forty-two years while imprisoned by the Jews; and by it he was spiritually enlightened. One of Joseph's descendants, to whom the keeping of the Holy Grail had come, proved unworthy, and the cup was lost. Arthur's knights endeavored to recover it; but all save Sir Galahad failed, because it could not be found by any one who was not a virgin in body. Several churches in France and Italy claimed to have it; and there is now in Genoa a cup brought by the Crusaders of 1101, which was at one time considered the Holy Grail. The explanation of all this is, that by the Holy Grail is meant the holy wafer which has been transmuted into the veritable body of Christ. The legend is, therefore, a legend of the Eucharist. The "quest of the Holy Grail" is the attempt to see the Saviour as he is revealed in the Eucharist.

"The word 'graal' is a corruption of gradale, or graduale, the Latin name for a liturgical collection of psalms, and texts of Scripture, so called because they are sung as the priest is passing from the epistle to the gospel side of the altar. The author of the Grail conception meant by graal, or graduale, not the sacred dish (escuelte), but the mysterious book revealed to the supposed hermit of 717, in which he finds the history of the escuelle." The author of the legend was probably Walter Map, a canon of Salisbury, in the twelfth century. From England it spread all over Europe. Besides the derivation already given, there are others, as from the Old French grasal ('the sacre gral'), a corruption of sanguinis realis, because they are sung as the priest is passing from the epistle to the gospel side of the altar. The author of the Grail conception meant by graal, or graduale, not the sacred dish (escuelle), but the mysterious book revealed to the supposed hermit of 717, in which he finds the history of the escuelle. The author of the legend was probably Walter Map, a canon of Salisbury, in the twelfth century. From England it spread all over Europe. Besides the derivation already given, there are others, as from the Old French grasal ('the sacre gral'), a corruption of sanguinis realis, corrupted to sangreal, sangreal. See the comprehensive article of Thomas Arnold, in the 9th ed. Encyc. Brit., vol. xi. pp. 34—36; also VILLEMARQUE: Les romans de la table ronde, Paris, 1860; F. J. Furnivall's edition of a manuscript History of the Holy Grail, London, 1874; PAULIN PARIS: Romans de la table ronde, Paris, 1876; E. HUCHEP: Le St. Grail, ou le Joseph d'Arimathie, Le Mans, 1876—79.

GRABE, Johann Ernst, b. at Königsberg, July 10, 1868; d. in London, Nov. 13, 1711; went to...
GRACE.

England in 1697, and was made chaplain of Christ Church, Oxford, 1700. He is famous for his edition of the Revised Version (1755-6). He was joined by Benjamin Hurd, who also worked on the translation.

The doctrine of grace, as defined by the Reformed theologians, is the fundamental principle of systematic theology. It is to a certain extent the sphere of the divine attributes, appearing in anthropology as the decree of salvation, is the fundamental idea of Christ's life and work, underlies the agency of the Spirit, and accomplishes its perfect work in the consummation of redemption in the life to come.

Grace is the underlying principle and essential characteristic of the Christian religion. The doctrine has a place, and sheds a peculiar lustre, in all the five divisions of systematic theology. It is to a certain extent the sphere of the divine attributes, appearing in anthropology as the decree of salvation, is the fundamental idea of Christ's life and work, underlies the agency of the Spirit, and accomplishes its perfect work in the consummation of redemption in the life to come.

Grace is the benevolence of God extended towards sinners, and overcoming their resistance by ethical means. It is its very nature to destroy the guilt of sin and redeem the sinner. Grace is God's goodness to the sinner, who does not deserve it (Eph. ii. 5, 8); mercy, his goodness to the suffering (Ps. xcviii. 3; John i. 14), now of justice (Rom. ii. 19). John (i. 14), Paul (Rom. iii. 24), and Peter (1 Pet. i. 13) agree in defining the fundamental principle of Christianity by the one word "grace." Some of the older theologians connected it with the divine love; others, with the divine goodness. A distinction has been made between grace, mercy, and long-suffering in this way: grace is God's goodness to the sinner, who does not deserve it (Eph. ii. 5, 8); mercy, his goodness to the suffering (Ps. xcviii. 3); and long-suffering, his goodness in delaying the punishment of sin, and affording the sinner further time to repent. Some of the modern theologians almost pass by grace in the discussion of the attributes; and Schleiermacher (§ 80) defines it as the power of the divine consciousness in the soul. It is the harmonious co-working of love and justice. The relation of grace to mercy is this: grace removes guilt, mercy removes misery from all creatures that suffer. But they not only remove, they make evil to work out the good. Grace's operations (imputed) guilt into a saving penalty; and mercy transforms death into the poison of death, or the effectual crown of the divine attributes, appearing in anthropology as the decree of salvation, is the fundamental idea of Christ's life and work, underlies the agency of the Spirit, and accomplishes its perfect work in the consummation of redemption in the life to come.

The grace of God in Christ has established a kingdom of grace which lies intermediate between the kingdoms of power and glory. This kingdom is the Christian Church, so far as Christ's word and spirit rule in her. Connected herewith is the idea of the duration of the period of grace. For the world, it is limited by the general judgment; for the individual, it reaches out through purgatory, according to the Roman-Catholic view: according to the Scriptures, however, it is measured by the obduracy of the sinner. But the Church properly regards the termination of the lives of the impetuous as a judgment, so long as this is not confused with the final judgment. The design of grace, however, is the perfection of man, and his glorification in heaven. The reward he will there receive will be in consequence of works of faith; but he will receive it upon the basis of grace, and from the hands of grace.

But the grace of God is more than an attribute of his nature, it is the very soul of revelation. God's eternal decree of grace (Eph. i. 5) includes the foreknowledge and election of the sinner, and in its revelation founds the covenant of grace, and after the fall establishes the kingdom of grace. This distinction between the covenant of grace and the covenant of works has been most insistently maintained by the Reformed and Congregationalists. The purpose of divine grace which lies at the basis of the O. T. dispensation (Gen. iii. 15) is fully realized in the life of Christ (Tit. ii. 11, iii. 4). Christ's very nature is grace (Rom. iii. 29); and hence his life was a continuous agency of grace, and its consummation the atonement for the sin of the world.

The doctrine of the atonement in the work of the Spirit and the application of the benefits of the atonement. The operations of grace which are designed to apply salvation are the victories of the sin-destroying and redeeming spirit of Christ over the consciousness of guilt in the human heart. The Holy Spirit is the mediator of grace, convincing the world of sin, etc. (John xvi. 8), teaching it (2 Tim. iii. 16), guiding it into the way of all truth (John xvi. 13), and helping it (Rom. viii. 26), and uses means of grace, such as the sacraments, prayers, the word, etc. The distinction has been made of unconditional and saving grace. Saving grace has, in turn, been distinguished into prevenient, which acts upon the sinner before repentance; converting, which affects conversion; and co-operant, or indwelling, which operates upon the believer as a sanctifying power. Grace is irresistible; but the Roman Catholics, Arminians, and Socinians allow a co-operation of the human will before conversion.

The Lutherans, on the other hand, attempted to take a middle course between strict predestinarianism (to which Luther assented in the De servo arbitrio) and synergism. Differences also exist on the question of the possibility of falling from grace; the Arminian, and, less confidently, the Lutheran theologians, affirming, the Calvinistic denying it.

The grace of God in Christ has established a kingdom of grace which lies intermediate between the kingdoms of power and glory. This kingdom is the Christian Church, so far as Christ's word and spirit rule in her. Connected herewith is the idea of the duration of the period of grace. For the world, it is limited by the general judgment; for the individual, it reaches out through purgatory, according to the Roman-Catholic view: according to the Scriptures, however, it is measured by the obduracy of the sinner. But the Church properly regards the termination of the lives of the impetuous as a judgment, so long as this is not confused with the final judgment.

The design of grace, however, is the perfection of man, and his glorification in heaven. The reward he will there receive will be in consequence of works of faith; but he will receive it upon the basis of grace, and from the hands of grace.

GRADUAL, a part of a psalm chanted in the mass between the epistle and the gospel; formerly called antiphonarium, or responsorium; received the name of "gradual" from its being sung from the steps (gradus) leading up to the altar.

GRAHAM, Isabella, an eminent Christian philanthropist b. in Lanark, Scot., June 29, 1742; d. in New York, July 27, 1814. She joined the Presbyterian Church at Paisley under Dr. Witherspoon, afterwards president of Princeton College. In 1763 she married Dr. Graham, a surgeon in the English army, with whom she went to Cavans, and subsequently to Antigua, where she died (1774). Returning in poverty to Scotland, she taught school in Paisley and in Edinburgh. In 1789, at the advice of Dr. Witherspoon, she embarked for New York, where she established a successful seminary for young ladies.
Mrs. Graham was foremost among the women of her day, in New-York City, in all benevolent enterprises. She was a pioneer in "woman's work" for woman in America. In 1796 she formed the New-York missionary society for the Indians, and in 1797 helped to found the society for the relief of poor widows with small children, in 1806 presided at a meeting for the organization of the first asylum for orphan children in the city, and in 1811 of a Magdalen society. She was also widely known for her activity in the church (Dr. John Mason's) with which she was connected, and for distributing Bibles among the poor, long before the Bible Society was established. See Life and Letters, last edition, London, 1838; Mason (her pastor): Life of Isabella Graham, Tract Society, New York; Mrs. Bethune (mother of Dr. Bethune, and her daughter): Letters and Correspondence of Mrs. Graham, 1838.

GRAHA ME, James, a religious poet; b. at Glasgow, April 22, 1768; d. at Sedgefield, Durham, Eng., Sept. 14, 1811. After prac tising law for many years, he took orders in the Church of England, and became curate of Shipton and Sedgefield successively. He is best known as the author of The Sabbath (1804), a poem in blank verse, descriptive of the sabbath of his native land, and charac terized by a fine vein of tender and devotional feeling, and by a happy delineation of Scotti sh scenery."

GRANDMONT, or GRAM MONT, Order of, one of the many religious orders arising in the latter part of the eleventh century; was founded in 1073 by Stephen of Tigerno, whose life has been written by Gerhard, the seventh prior of Grandmont, and is found in Martin E and Durand (Amplias. Collectio, VI. p. 1050). Born at Thiers (Tigerno), 1046, he was educated by Bishop Milo of Benevento, and returned to France in 1076, having obtained permission of Gregory VII. to found a religious order after the model of the Calabrian monks. He settled in Auvergne, at Muret, and found followers. After his death, Feb. 8, 1124, his disciples moved to the desert of Grandmont, after which they were called. The third successor of Stephen (Stephen of Bordeaux), called by the author of The Sabbath (1804), a poem in blank verse, descriptive of the sabbath of his native land, and characterized by a fine vein of tender and devotional feeling, and by a happy delineation of Scotti sh scenery."

GRATIAN, b. at Sirmium, 359; killed at Lyons, Aug. 25, 389; son of his father, Valentinian I., on the throne of the West-Roman Empire, 375, and his uncle Valens, on that of the East-Roman Empire, 378. In the last year he chose Theodosius as co-regent. The policy which he pursued with respect to the Church, and in which he was pushed still farther onward by Theodosius, was of decisive consequences. Religious liberty reigned; that is, Paganism, Arianism, and Catholicism were allowed to fight each other with what means they possessed. Under the influence of Ambrosius, Gratian made Catholicism not only the ruling; but the only tolerated Church. In 376 he forbade all heretics to assemble for any religious purpose, confiscated the property belonging to their churches, and transferred the buildings to the Catholics. In 377 he exempted all officers of the Catholic Church, down to the ostiarius, from all municipal services and all practising laws. In 452 he renewed even made the retail trade which the lower clergy was used to carry on in Illyria, Italy, and Gaul, free of duty. In 381 the Council of Constantinople spoke the anathema over all non-Nicene denominations. After the accession of Theodosius, Paganism was treated with the same severity as heretical Christianity. In 381 apostates from Christianity to Paganism lost their right to make a will. In 382 all sacerdotal privileges, even those of the vestal virgins, and all state-support, were withdrawn from Paganism, and real estate belonging to the Pagan temples was confiscated. Edicts against sacrifices, haruspices, etc., followed. The altar of victory in the hall of the senate was removed; and the emblems of the office of Pontifex Maximus Gratian declined to accept, because they were to him, as a Christian, a scandal. Of course, for these measures, the Pagan historians compared him with Nero; while the Catholics almost deified him. ADOLF HARNACK.

GRATIAN, the composer of the Decretum Gratiani; was a monk; first in Cloese, near Ravenna, afterwards in St. Felix, in Bologna; but the dates of his birth and death are unknown. About his work, which he finished in 1141 or 1151, see the art. on CANON LAW.

GRATRY, Father, b. at Lille, March 30, 1805; d. at Montreux, near Lausanne, Feb. 7, 1872; studied in Paris, but entered, after having determined to devote his life to the service of God, the convent of Buchenberg in the Vosges. After the revolution of 1830, the convent was dissolved, and Father Gratry was appointed teacher of theology and philosophy, first in the seminary of Strasbourg (1830-42), afterwards in the Stanislas College, in Paris (1842-47). In 1852 he renewed the order of the Oratorians; and from 1868 he lectured on theology and philosophy in the Sorbonne. He followed a somewhat similar direction as that of Lamennais, Lacordaire, and Montalembert; but he was of a milder and more poetic disposition. During the Council of the Vatican he published four letters in opposition to the doctrine of papal infallibility; but, when the dogma was promulgated, he accepted it. Most of his works are half devotional, and half
GRAUL. 898 GREECE.

scientifico.—La Connaissance de Dieu, Lettres sur la religion (against positivism), La Morale et la loi de l'histoire (an exposition of his social ideas), Meditations, etc.

GRAUL, Karl, b. at Wrolitz, in Anhalt-Dessau, Feb. 6, 1814; d. at Erlangen, Nov. 10, 1864; studied theology at Leipzig; lived for some time in Italy; and taught Latin and French in an English family; published in 1843 a translation of Dante's Inferno, with theological explanations; and was in 1844 appointed director of the missionary society in Dresden. This institution he gradually raised from a very subordinate to a very prominent position, making it the missionary organ of the whole Lutheran Church, instead of a mere appendix to the missionary society of Basel. In 1848 he had it removed to Leipzig in order to give the students the benefit of the university. The point upon which he concentrated the energy of the institution was the Tamil, a nation of about twelve millions of souls in Southern India; and the object was not simply to make converts, but to convert the whole people. From 1849 to 1853 he made a visit to the country himself, published a description of his journey (in five volumes, Leipzig, 1853-56), wrote a Tamil grammar, and brought back some of the principal monuments of Tamil literature, which he edited, partly with German, and partly with English translations (Bibliotheca Tamulica, Leipzig, 1854-58, 5 vols.). His views of the attitude which the missionary ought to assume with respect to the question of caste, differed radically from those entertained by the English missionaries; which occasioned him to publish an English pamphlet at Madras (1852), and a German at Leipzig (1861), in their defence. In 1860 his failing health compelled him to retire. Among his other works are Unterscheidungslehren (1845, 9th ed. by Harnack, 1872), Indische Sinnflammen (1864), etc. LUTHARDT.

GRAVEN IMAGES. See Idolatry.

GRAVES, Richard, D.D., b. at Killfinnan, Ireland, Oct. 1, 1788; d. March 29, 1829; Dean of Arundel and Servia, Trinity College, Dublin, 1813; author of the Donnellan Lectures for 1797-1801, On the Four Last Books of the Pentateuch, London, 1807, 2 vols. His whole works were collected (London, 1840, 4 vols.) with a biography by his son.

GREECE, the Kingdom of, such as its boundaries were fixed by the great powers of Europe, July 21, 1832, comprises an area of 19,353 square miles, and has (according to the census of 1879) 1,979,775 inhabitants, of whom an immense majority belong to the Orthodox Greek Church. By the treaty of Berlin, Thessaly has been added to the kingdom. In 1870 there were in Greece 12,585 Roman Catholics, 2,582 Jews, and 917 belonging to other religious communities. In 1879 there were 16,684 persons in the country not belonging to the State Church. At the beginning of the Christian era those territories which now form the kingdom of Greece formed the Roman province of Achaia. The proconsul resided at Corinth, which, politically and commercially, was the most important city of the country. As a place, however, of learning and art, Athens still held the first rank. It was almost indispensable for a Roman youth who wanted to distinguish himself in life to go to Athens and study. Her schools of grammar, rhetoric, dialectics, and philosophy, were crowded; though they had lost all productivity, and labored only as educational institutions. Christianity was first planted in these regions by Paul, on his second voyage (51). He first visited Philippi (Acts xvi. 11, 12); then Thessalonica; and Corinth (xvii., xviii.): only the last two cities belonged to Achaia. But, while the congregation of Corinth became one of Paul's most brilliant and most important foundations, very little is heard of the congregation of Athens. Paul's stay there was very brief; but his address on Mars' Hill was one of the most remarkable speeches in history, whether we consider the speaker, the audience, or the theme (xvii. 22-31). Dionysius the Areopagite, converted on this occasion, is said to have been its first bishop. The reason why the first city in the world, in intellectual respects, showed itself so singularly backward in its relation to Christianity, was, no doubt, the presence of the above-mentioned schools, which made it the very centre of Paganism. They were closed by Justinian, A.D. 529. In the interior of Peloponnesus, Pagans were found as late as the fourteenth century. Leo the Isaurian, in the beginning of the eighth century, laid Achaia under the authority of the Patriarch of Constantinople; and there it remained for more than a thousand years.

During the war of independence (1821-27) the connection between the Church of Greece and the Patriarch of Constantinople gradually loosened: he received no reverence from the country, and the ecclesiastics he appointed and sent thither were not accepted. Capodistrias favored the separation; and (July 23, 1833) the regency took the decisive step, and declared, on the instance of thirty-six metropolitans assembled at Nauplia, that the Orthodox Church of Greece was independent of any foreign authority. The new church organization was moulded after the model of the Russian Church; but the union of Church and State is not nearly so intimate, because the present king is a Protestant (Lutheran), from Denmark, while the Czar is actual head of the Russian Church; but the union of Church and State is not nearly so intimate, because the present king is a Protestant (Lutheran), from Denmark, while the Czar is actual head of the Russian Church; but the union of Church and State is not nearly so intimate, because the present king is a Protestant (Lutheran), from Denmark, while the Czar is actual head of the Russian Church; but the union of Church and State is not nearly so intimate, because the present king is a Protestant (Lutheran), from Denmark, while the Czar is actual head of the Russian Church; but the union of Church and State is not nearly so intimate, because the present king is a Protestant (Lutheran), from Denmark, while the Czar is actual head of the Russian Church; but the union of Church and State is not nearly so intimate, because the present king is a Protestant (Lutheran), from Denmark, while the Czar is actual head of the Russian Church; but the union of Church and State is not nearly so intimate, because the present king is a Protestant (Lutheran), from Denmark, while the Czar is actual head of the Russian Church; but the union of Church and State is not nearly so intimate, because the present king is a Protestant (Lutheran), from Denmark, while the Czar is actual head of the Russian Church; but the union of Church and State is not nearly so intimate, because the present king is a Protestant (Lutheran), from Denmark, while the Czar is actual head of the Russian Church; but the union of Church and State is not nearly so intimate, because the present king is a Protestant (Lutheran), from Denmark, while the Czar is actual head of the Russian Church; but the union of Church and State is not nearly so intimate, because the present king is a Protestant (Lutheran), from Denmark, while the Czar is actual head of the Russian Church; but the union of Church and State is not nearly so intimate, because the present king is a Protestant (Lutheran), from Denmark, while the Czar is actual head of the Russian Church; but the union of Church and State is not nearly so intimately. The country was divided into eleven archbishoprics and thirteen bishoprics. An archbishop's salary is a hundred and eighty pounds; a bishop's, a hundred and forty-five pounds; they are paid by the State. The lower clergy is not paid at all, but lives by fees for
GREEK CHURCH.

prayers, exorcisms, consecrations, purifications, and other spiritual services. The total number of ecclesiastics was 5,102 in 1861. There were 1,600 monks and 1,500 nuns in 1879.

In Greece the Church forms the strongest band around the nation,—much stronger than either blood or speech. During the war of independence the Moslems of Crete and the Latins of Syros sided with the Turks, though they were of the purest Greek descent, and spoke the Greek language. Under such circumstances it is not to be wondered at that the missions which have been established in the country by the Protestant Church, by the Episcopal Church, by the American Board of Missions, and, lately, by the Danish Church, have had very little success. In 1886 the Archbishop of Athens excommunicated all the families which allowed their children to be educated in the English and American mission schools, though the religious instruction was given there by a member of the Orthodox Greek Church. It was hoped that the university established at Athens in 1837 would have an influence on this stubborn narrowness. But of its twelve hundred and forty-four students in 1872, only twenty-six studied theology. Besides the theological faculty of the university, there are four theological seminaries, one in Athens, and three in the provinces; but they had in 1872 only a hundred and fifteen students in all. The lower clergy in Greece receives no education at all. The Anglican Church maintains five chaplains in Athens, Syros, Patras, Corfu, and Zante, who stand under the Bishop of Gibraltar.

Protestant Missions in Athens. These are not extensive. 1. The pioneer missionary was the Rev. John Henry Hill, D.D., LL.D., b. New York, Sept. 11, 1791; sailed with his wife for Athens, September, 1830; d. there July 1, 1862. He was careful to avoid collision with the Greek hierarchy; did not attempt to organize a church, but confined himself to teaching. His school of six hundred pupils is still kept up. The children are taught, besides the usual secular branches, Bible history, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the Nicene Creed in its original form (i.e., without the Filioque clause). This mission is supported by the (American) Church Missionary Society.

2. The Southern Presbyterian Church has two missionaries in Athens,—Rev. Mr. Sampson and Rev. Mr. Kalokeranitis, M.D. They have a fine church at the foot of the Acropolis. In connection with this mission is a union depot of the British and American Bible societies.

3. Near the Presbyterian Church is a Baptist mission in a private house, conducted by another Americanized Greek, Rev. Mr. Sakellarios.

The hero of Protestant missions in Greece is Rev. Dr. Jonas King, who died in 1869 (see art.). The Woman's Union Missionary Society had a girl's school in Athens; but the government closed it because the teachers refused to teach the Greek Catechism and to hang up a picture of the Virgin Mary for instruction.


GREEK CHURCH. The. 1. NAME. The proper name is the Eastern or Oriental Church, which designates its origin and geographical territory; also the Orthodox Church, which expresses its close adherence to the ecumenical system of doctrine and discipline as settled by the seven ecumenical councils before the separation from the Latin Church. On this title she lays the chief stress, and celebrates it on a special day called "Orthodoxy Sunday," in the beginning of Lent, when a dramatic representation of the old ecumenical councils is given in the churches, and anathemas are pronounced on all heresies. The full official title is the Holy Orthodox Catholic Apostolic Eastern Church (ἡ ὑπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καθολικὴ ἀποστολικὴ ἀποστολὴ θρησκεία). The Roman Church claims all these titles, except "Oriental," for which she substitutes "Roman," and claims them exclusively. The popular designation Greek Church, though not strictly correct, refers to the national origin and to the language in which most of its liturgies, canons, theological and ascetic literature, are composed, and its worship mainly conducted.

II. EXTENT. The Eastern Church embraces the Greek, the Russian, and other Slavonic nationalities. It has its seat in Western Asia and Eastern Europe, chiefly in Turkey, Serbia, Roumania, Greece, Russia, and some parts of Austria. Bulgaria was long a bone of contention between Constantinople and Rome, and one of the causes of separation, but is now an independent branch of the "Orthodox" Church, ruled by an exarch. In Western Europe and America there are only a few isolated congregations of Greek merchants and colonists, or in connection with the Russian embassies (at Vienna, Trieste, Geneva, Paris, London, New York, San Francisco). The Eastern Church is one of the three great divisions of Christendom, and numbers (according to the estimate made in 1861) between eighty and ninety millions; while the Roman-Catholic Church is credited with a membership of over two hundred millions, and the Protestant churches with one hundred and thirty millions. In Europe the Greek Church numbers 71,405,000; in Asia, 9,402,000; in Africa, 3,500,000; in America, 13,000; total, 84,017,000. Its chief stress lies in the vast empire of Russia, which was Christianized in the ninth and tenth centuries by missionaries from Constantinople, and matrimonial connection with the Byzantine court.

III. DIVISION. The Greek Church is divided into several great branches. 1. The Orthodox Church in Turkey, under the Patriarch of Constantinople, with the subordinate patriarchates of Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Antioch. Constantinople, the city of the first Christian emperor (New Rome), though now in the hands of the Turk, is still the natural centre of the whole Greek Church, and may become for the Eastern world at some future day, in Christian hands, that Gregory Nazianzen eloquently described it to be in the fourth century,—"the eye of the world, the strongest by sea and land, the bond of union between East and West, to which the most distant extremes from all sides converge, which they look up as to a common centre and emporium of the faith."

2. The Orthodox Church in Russia, which was at first subject to the Patriarch of Constantinople, then under a special Patriarch of Moscow (since
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1892), and now (since 1721) under the permanent holy synod of St. Petersburg and the Czar, whose dominion stretches in an unbroken line across the two Continents of Europe and Asia. The Czar is the personal, as Constantinople is the local, centre of the whole Greek Church; and he keeps a lustful eye upon the city of the Bosphorus, sacred territory of the future capital, where, at no distant day, there must be a tremendous reckoning with Mohammedanism.

3. The National Church of the kingdom of Greece, which since 1833 is governed likewise by a permanent holy synod, but less dependent upon the State than the Russian Church. See GREECE.

4. The Greek Church in the formerly Turkish provinces of Servia, Roumania, and Montenegro, are now independent of the Patriarch of Constantinople, and ruled by their metropolitans and synods, more or less under the influence of Russia.

5. Distinct from these, and belonging directly to the Roman Church, are the united Greeks, scattered through Turkey, Hungary, Galicia, Transylvania, and Russia, but chiefly in Austria and Poland, and numbering in all about four millions and a half. They acknowledge the authority of the Pope, and adopt the dogma of the double procession of the Holy Spirit, but are otherwise allowed to hold to their ancient discipline, marriage of the lower clergy, communion under both kinds (communio sub utraque), leavened bread, their liturgy, and the use of the Greek language.

6. The Greek, or rather Oriental Schismatics, Nestorians, Jacobites, Armenians, Copts, and Abyssinians, are separated from the Greek and Latin Catholic Church, mostly on the dogma of Christ's person, and have independent organizations, which rise up, as the broken fragments of ancient national churches, from surrounding Mohammedanism and heathenism in Western Asia and Africa. The Maronites on Mount Lebanon were formerly schismatic, but were converted to the Roman Church during the middle ages. The Roman Church has made inroads also among the other Oriental sects, especially the Armenians. The dissenters from the Orthodox Church of Russia are divided into two principal parties: the chief of them are the Raskolniki, or Old Believers, who protest against all the innovations introduced by Patriarch Nikon and Peter the Great.

IV. Historical Survey.—The Greek Church has no continuous history, like the Latin or the Protestant. She has long periods of mononony and stagnation; she is isolated from the main current of progressive Christendom; her languages and literature are little known among Western scholars. Yet this Church is the oldest in Christendom, and for several centuries she was the chief bearer of our religion. She still occupies the sacred territory of primitive Christianity, and claims most of the apostolic sees, as Jerusalem, Antioch, and the churches founded by Paul and John in Asia Minor and Greece. All the apostles, with the exception of Peter and Paul, labored and died in the East. From the old Greeks she inherited the language and certain national traits of character, while she incorporated into herself also much of Jewish and Oriental piety. She produced the first Christian literature, apologies of the Christian faith, refutations of heathenism, commentaries of the Bible, sermons, homilies, and ascetic treatises. The great majority of the early fathers, like the apostles themselves, used the Greek language. Polycarp, Ignatius, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Cyril of Alexandria produced a host of Christian literature. Anastasius and Constantine the Great, together with a host of martyrs and confessors, belong to the Greek communion. She elaborated the ecumenical dogmas of the Trinity and Christology, and ruled the first seven ecumenical councils, which were all held in Constantinople or its immediate neighborhood (Nicea, Chalcedon, Ephesus). Her palmy period during the first five centuries will ever claim the grateful respect of the whole Christian world; and her great teachers still live in their writings far beyond the confines, nay, even more outside of her communion, as the books of Moses and the prophets were known to and understood among Christians than among the Jews, for whom they wrote. But she never materially progressed beyond the stand-point occupied in the fifth and sixth centuries. She has no proper middle age, and no Reformation, like Western Christendom.

We may distinguish three periods in the history of the Greek Church:

1. The classical or productive period, the first five or six centuries, which has just been characterized. The last great divine of the East is John of Damascus (about 790), who summed up the scattered results of the labors of the preceding fathers into a tolerably complete system of theology; but he is an isolated phenomenon. The process of degeneracy and stagnation had already set in; and the former life and vigor gave way to idle speculations, distracting controversies, dead formalism, and traditionalism.

2. The Byzantine period, corresponding to the middle ages of the Latin Church, from the rise of Mohammedanism to the fall of Constantinople (A.D. 650-1453). Here we have the gradual separation from the West and from all progressive movements; dependence on the imperial court at Constantinople, the chief literary center; the rise of certain literary activity; philological and biblical studies in Slavonic dependence on the fathers; commentaries of Euseemon (A.D. 1000), Theophylact (d. 1107), Euthymius Zigabenus (d. about 1120); large literary collections, classical and Christian, of Photius (about 890), Balsamon, Zonaras, Suidas, and Simeon Metaphrastes; the liturgical works of Maximus, Sophronius, Simeon of Thessalonica; the Byzantine historians; the image controversy (726-842); inroads and conquests of Mohammedanism (since 630), in Syria, Persia, Egypt, North Africa; temporary suspension of the patriarchate of Alexandria, Egypt, Jerusalem; finally, the conquest of Constantinople by the Turks, and the extinction of the Greek Empire (1453), which led to the emigration of Greek scholars (Chalcondylas, Chrysoloras, Pletho, Michael Aposolius, Theodore Gaza, George Zonaras), the study of Greek literature, the revival of the de-Biblical tradition, the study of the Greek Testament, and, aided thereby, the preparation for the Reforma-
conquest in the conversion of the Slavonians (namely, the Bulgarians and Russians, in the ninth and tenth centuries); while the Latin Church converted the Celtic and Teutonic races.

3. The modern period may be dated from the downfall of the Greek Empire (1453). It presents in Asia stagnation and slavery under the tyranny of the Turks, but with great tension and independence as to all internal affairs; in Europe, the development of a Western Empire of Russia, with some reforms in manners, customs, and the introduction of Western culture, protests against Romanizing and evangelical movements, the orthodox confession of Peter Moglias (1842), the synod of Jerusalem (1672), the Russian Church, the patriarchate of Moscow, the reforms of Patriarch Nikon (d. 1681) and of the Czar Peter the Great (d. 1725), the re-union of the Old Believers (Raskolniki), the holy synod of St. Petersburg (since 1721), the New Greek Church in Hellas (since 1833), modern influences from the West, prospects for the future, depending chiefly on Russia.

V. RELATION TO THE LATIN CHURCH.—No two churches are so much alike in their creed, polity, and cultus, as the Greek and Roman; and yet no two are such irreconcilable rivals, perhaps for the very reason of their affinity. They agree much more than either agrees with any Protestant church. They were never organically united. They differed from the beginning in nationality, language, and genius, as the ancient Greeks differed from the Romans; yet they grew up together, and stood shoulder to shoulder in the ancient conflict with Paganism and heresy. They co-operated in the early ecumenical councils, and adopted their doctrinal and ritual decisions. But the development of the papal monarchy, and the establishment of a Western Empire in connection with it, laid the foundation of a schism which has not been healed to this day.

The controversy culminated in the rivalry between the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Pope of Rome. It first broke out under Photius and Nicolas I., who excommunicated each other (869 and 879). Photius, the greatest scholar of his age, whom Pope Nicolas refused to acknowledge as patriarch, charged, in a famous encyclical letter, the Roman Church with heresy, for the unauthorized insertion of the Filioque into the Nicene Creed, and with various corrupting practices. The controversy was renewed under the Patriarch Cerularius (1053), and became irreconcilable through the Venetian conquest of Constantinople (1204), and the establishment of a Latin Empire (1204—61), and Latin rival bishoprics in eastern seas, with the sanction of Pope Innocent III. Attempts at a re-union were made from time to time, especially in the Council of Lyons (1274) and the Council of Ferrara (1439), but all in vain. The compromise formula of the latter council was rejected with scorn in the Council of Florence (1439). The fall of Constantinople (1453) the political motive for seeking a union with the West ceased; and the schism continues to this day, even with increased force, since the Vatican Council in 1870 intensified the chief cause of separation by declaring papal infallibility an article of faith. Popery knows no compromise; and the Greek Church can never submit to its authority without committing suicide.

The points in which the Greek Church differs from the Roman are the following: the single procession of the Holy Spirit (against the Filioque); the equality of the patriarchs, and the rejection of the papacy as an antichristian innovation and usurpation; the right of the lower clergy (priests and deacons) to marry (though only once); the communion under both kinds against the withdrawal of the cup from the laity; trine immersion as the only valid form of baptism; the use of the vernacular languages in worship; a number of minor ceremonies, as the use of common or leavened bread in the Eucharist, infant communion, the repetition of holy unction (extasion) in sickness, etc.

On the fruitless negotiations for union between the Lutheran and the Greek Church, and the Anglican and the Greek and Russian Church, see Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, vol. I., pp. 50 sqq. and 74 sqq. The Reformation of the sixteenth century had no effect upon the Oriental Church. The reform movement of Cyril Lucar, who, as Patriarch of Constantinople, attempted to ingraft Calvinism upon the old trunk, failed completely: he was strangled to death, and his body thrown into the Bosphorus (1838); and his doctrines were condemned by several synods, in 1638, 1643, and 1672. (See Schaff, Creeds, I. 54 sqq.)

Recent times, however, German universities are often frequented by Russian and Greek students; and the works of German divines have exerted some modifying influence. The Old Catholic movement was followed with interest; and the Old Catholic conferences in Bonn (1874 and 1875) were attended by several dignitaries from Greece and Russia. There has been also considerable intercourse between Greek and Anglican bishops. The Greek Church is not so strongly committed against Protestantism as the Roman, and may therefore learn something from it.

VI. CREED.—The Eastern Church holds fast to the decrees and canons of the seven ecumenical councils; i.e., of Nicea (325), Constantinople (381), Ephesus (431), Chalcedon (451), the second of Constantinople (588), the third of Constantinople (680), the second of Nicea (787). Her proper creed is the Nicene Creed as enlarged at Constantinople (381), and indorsed at Chalcedon (451), without the Latin Filioque. This creed is the basis of all Greek catechisms and systems of theology, and a regular part of worship. The Greeks have never acknowledged in form the Apostles' Creed, which is of Western origin, nor the Athanasian Creed, which teaches the double procession, and is likewise of Western origin. Besides this ecumenical creed, the Eastern Church acknowledges three subordinate confessions, which define her position against Romanism and Protestantism; namely, (1) The Orthodox Confession of Peter Moglias (metropolitan of Kiev), A.D. 1643,—a catechetical exposition of the Nicene Creed, the Lord's Prayer and Beatitudes, and the Decalogue; (2) The Eighteen Articles or Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem, A.D. 1672; (3) The Longer Russian Catechism of Philaret (metropolitan of Moscow), adopted by the holy synod of St. Petersburg (1839), and published in all the languages of Russia. (See these creeds and con-
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fessions in the second volume of Schaff's Creeds of Christendom.)

VII. THEOLOGY. — The Greek Church is in doctrine substantially agreed with the Roman, but, upon the whole, more simple and less developed, though in some respects more subtle and metaphysical. The only serious doctrinal difference is that on the Procession of the Holy Spirit (see Filioque Controversy). She holds to the leading principles, but rejects many of the consequences or results, of Roman Catholicism. She adheres to the theology of the Greek fathers down to John of Damascus, and ignores the succeeding scholastic theology of the schoolmen, who completed the Roman system. The Eastern theology is not properly systematized: it remains rigidly in the fragmentary state of the old councils. The resistance to the Western clause, Filioque, implied a protest against all further progress both in truth and in error, and meant stagnation, as well as faithful adherence to the venerable Nicene symbol. The Greek theology is most full on the doctrine of God and of Christ, but very defective on the doctrine of man and the order of salvation. The East went into all sorts of theological and christological subtleties, especially during the long and tedious Monophysite controversies, which found little or no response in the West; but it ignored the Pelagian controversies, the development of the Augustinian and later evangelical theology. It took the most intense interest in the doctrine of man and the order of salvation. The cause for this difference must be sought in the prevailing metaphysical, rhetorical, and objective character of the Eastern Church. The Greek fathers, as distinct from the practical, logical, and subjective tendency of the Western churches, which is derived from the Roman and the Teutonic nationalities. The difference is illustrated already by the Nicene Creed, with its metaphysical terms about the Son, as compared with the more simple and popular Apostles' Creed, which originated in the West, and is very little used in the East.

VIII. GOVERNMENT. — The Greek Church is a patriarchal oligarchy, in distinction from the papal monarchy. The episcopal hierarchy is retained, the papacy rejected. The Vatican decrees of 1870 have intensified the separation. Centralization is unknown in the East. The patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, are equal in rights, though the first has a primacy of honor. The Czar of Russia, however, exercises a sort of general protectorate, and may be regarded as a sort of temporal Pope of Rome, but has no authority in matters of doctrine, and can make no organic changes. The Eastern hierarchy resembles the Jewish type. The Greek priest within the veil of the sanctuary is concealed from the eyes of the people; but in social respects he is nearer the people than the Roman priest. He is allowed, and even compelled, to marry once, but forbidden to marry twice. Celibacy is confined to bishops and monks. Absolution is given only in the form of penitence, 'May the Lord absolve thee!' instead of the positive form, 'I absolve thee.' The confessional exists, but in a milder form, with less influence and abuse, than in Romanism. The laity are more independent; and the Russian Czar, like the Byzantine Emperor of old, is the head of the Church in his dominion. Theunction of confirmation is made to symbolize the royal priesthood of every believer. The monastic orders, though including many clergy, are not clerical institutions. The community of Athos is a lay corporation with chaplains.

The administration of the churches as developed in the Byzantine Empire is most complicated, and involves, besides the regular clergy, an army of higher and lower ecclesiastical offices, from the first administrator of the church property (ο μεγας οικονομος), the superintendent of the sacristy (ο χορωφιας), the chancellor or keeper of ecclesiastical archives (ο χορωφιας), down to the keepers of the images of saints (ο βασσυγαρης). These half-clerical officers are divided into two groups, one on the right, the other on the left: each is subdivided into three classes, and each class has again five persons. Leo Allatius and Heinicius enumerat fifteen officials of the right group, and even more of the left. But many of these offices have either ceased altogether, or retain only a nominal existence.

IX. THE CULTUS is much like the Roman Catholic, with the celebration of the sacrifice of the mass as its centre, with an equal and even more of the left. But many of these offices have either ceased altogether, or retain only a nominal existence.

IX. THE CULTUS is much like the Roman Catholic, with the celebration of the sacrifice of the mass as its centre, with an equal and even more of the left. But many of these offices have either ceased altogether, or retain only a nominal existence. The East absorb the attention of the senses, that there is little room left for intellectual and spiritual worship. They use the liturgy of St. Chrysostom, which is an abridgment of that of St. Basil, yet very lengthy, and contains, with many old and venerable prayers (one of the finest is incorporated in the Anglican Liturgy under the name of Chrysostom), later additions from different sources to an excess and liturgicalism. Stanley (Eastern Church, p. 32) characterizes the Greek worship as "a union of barbaric rudeness and elaborate ceremonialism."

The most characteristic features of Greek worship, as distinct from the Roman, are the threefold immersion in baptism, with the reservation of any other mode as essentially invalid; the simultaneous performance of the act of confirmation and the act of baptism, which in the West have been separated; the anointing with oil in cases
of dangerous illness, which Rome has changed into extreme acuteness of the dying; infant communion, which the Latin Church has not only abandoned, but forbidden; the communion under two kinds (κατὰ τὰ δύο είδη, sub utraque); the use of leavened instead of unleavened bread in the Eucharist; the standing and eastward posture in prayer; the stricter separation between sexes; the use of the screen or veil before the altar; and the withdrawal of the performance of the mysteries (sacraments) from the eyes of the people.

The worship of saints, relics, flat images, and the cross, is carried as far as, or even farther, than in the Roman Church; but statues, bas-reliefs, and crucifixes are forbidden. The ruler the art, the more intense is the superstition. In Russia especially the veneration for pictures of the Virgin Mary and the saints is carried to the utmost extent, and takes the place of the Protestant veneration for the Bible. The holy picture with the lamp burning before it is found and worshipped in the corner of every room. The modern Russian prayer-book is full of prayers to the saints and to angels, and has the phrase "Glory to God!" continually on its lips. And yet even the priests are grossly intemperate; and public officials, even to the highest dignitaries, are said to be open to bribery. The nihilistic troubles, and the awful assassination of Alexander II., in 1881, reveal an abyss of corruption and danger beneath the glittering surface of Russian grandeur.

X. As to Christian life, it has the same general features as in the Roman-Catholic Church. The mass of the people are contented with an ordinary morality, while the monks aim at a higher degree of ascetic piety. The monastic system originated in the East (in Egypt), and continues to this day, but has not developed into great monastic orders, as in the West. There are three classes of monks, the cenobites (κοινωνικοί), who live together in a monastery ruled by an archimandrite, who is often a bishop (ἀρχιμανδρίτης, ὁ ιερεύς); the anchorites (ἀνακόρητοι), who live in a cell apart from the other monks, or among the laity; and the ascetics (ἀσκοται), or hermits. The monks usually follow the rule of St. Basil; some, the rule of St. Anthony. The bishops are taken from the monks. The principal convents are at Jerusalem, Mount Athos, Mount Sinai (where the celebrated Sinaitic manuscript of the Bible was kept for centuries, but not used by the inmates), and St. Saba, near the Dead Sea. Russia had in 1875 about six thousand convents and nunneries. The Greek Christians are very religious in outward observances and devotions, but know little of what Protestants mean by subjective experimental piety, and personal direct communion of the soul with the Saviour. They are liberal and deceitful in unmeaning compliments. The Greek Christians surpass their Mohammedan neighbors in chastity, but are behind them in honesty. What St. Paul says of the Cretans (Compare ye with ye, Tit. i. 12) is still characteristic of the race, of course with very honorable exceptions. In Russia there is the same divorce between religion and morality. The towns are adorned with churches and convents. Every public event is celebrated by the building of a church. Every house has an altar and sacred pictures; every child, his guardian angel and baptismal cross. A Russian fasts every Wednesday and Friday, prays early and late, regularly attends mass, confesses his sins, pays devout respect to sacred places and things, makes pilgrimages to the tombs and shrines of saints, and has the phrase "Slava Boga!" ("Glory to God!") continually on his lips. And yet even the priests are grossly intemperate; and public officials, even to the highest dignitaries, are said to be open to bribery. The nihilistic troubles, and the awful assassination of Alexander II., in 1881, reveal an abyss of corruption and danger beneath the glittering surface of Russian grandeur.

Concerning the extent of the canon of the Scriptures the Eastern Church is not quite consistent, and stands midway between the Roman and the Protestant view concerning the Jewish Apocrypha. The Septuagint is used, which includes the Apocrypha. The Orthodox Confession repeatedly quotes the Apocrypha as authority; and the synod of Jerusalem (1672) mentions several apocryphal books (The Wisdom of Solomon, Judith, Tobit, the History of Bel and the Dragon, the History of Susanna and the Dragon, the History of Sirach, and the Wisdom of Sirach) as parts of the Holy Scriptures. On the other hand, Metrophanes enumerates only twenty-two books of the Old Testament (according to the division of Josephus, who counts the twelve minor prophets as one, and combines several historical books), and eleven books of the New Testament (counting fourteen Epistles of Paul as one book, and the two Epistles of Peter and the three of John), and then speaks of the Jewish Apocrypha as not being received by the Church among the canonical and authentic books, and hence not to be used in proof of dogmas. The Longer Catechism of Philaret likewise enumerates (with Josephus, St. Cyril, and St. Athanasius) only twenty-two books of the Old Testament and twenty-seven books of the New, and says that "the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach and certain other books" are ignored in the list of the books of the Old Testament, because they do not exist in the Hebrew and are not found in the Septuagint. The use of the apocryphal books is found in this, that they have been appointed by the fathers to be read by proselytes who are preparing for admission into the church.

As to the circulation of the Scriptures among the laity, it is not encouraged; and certain portions, especially of the Old Testament, are declared to be unfit for general use. But the Greek Church has never expressly prohibited the read-
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ing of the Bible in the vulgar tongue to the people; and the Orthodox Church of Russia has also had a popular version of the Bible, first in the old Slavic, and now in modern Russ. Alexander I., by a ukase of Jan. 14, 1813, allowed even the British and Foreign Bible Society to establish a branch in St. Petersburg. Through the labors of this society nearly five hundred thousand copies of the New Testament, and the Psalms were circulated, in thirty-two languages, all over the empire, and read with great avidity. A recent traveller says, "Except in New England and in Scotland, no people in the world, so far as they can read at all, are greater Bible-readers than the Russians" (Herzow. Dix. Free Russia, p. 290). A priest told him, "Love for the Bible and love for Russia go with us hand in hand. A patriotic government gives us the Bible: a monastic government (Nicholas) takes it away." But it should be remembered that not more than one out of ten Russians can read at all. The Bible drove the Jesuits from Russia, who opposed it with all their might. In 1825 Nicholas, under the influence of the monks, or the black clergy, placed the Bible under arrest, and replaced it by an official Book of Saints. Alexander II., the emancipator of the serfs, has also emancipated the Bible, and restored, in part at least, the liberty of the Bible Society, but restricted it to the Protestant population. The printing and circulating of the Bible in the Russian language and within the Orthodox Greek Church is under the exclusive control of the holy synod of St. Petersburg. Agents of the Bible Society were allowed to circulate the Scriptures in the army during the recent war with Turkey (1877).

XII. MISSIONS.—The Eastern Church spreads, through Russian influence, in Siberia, the Aegean Islands, and wherever the civil and military power of the Czar prepares the way; but, apart from the aid of governments, she has little or no missionary spirit, and is content to keep her own. Her greatest mission-work was the conversion of Russia; and this was effected, not so much by preaching as by the marriage of a Byzantine princess and the despotic order of the ruler. In the midst of the Mohammedan East the Greek populations remain like islands in the barren sea; and the Bedouin tribes have wandered for twelve centuries round the Greek convent of Mount Sinai, probably without one instance of conversion to the creed of men whom they yet acknowledge with almost religious veneration as beings from a higher world (Stanley, p. 34). If the Turks are ever to be converted to Christianity, it must be done by other churches. Mohammedans regard the Greek and Roman Christians as idolaters, and cannot but despise the monks who disapprove their rites and the traditional spot of the nativity and crucifixion, and have to be kept in order by Turkish soldiers.

The want of missionary spirit, however, accounts also for greater freedom from the curse of proselytism and persecuting intolerance. The history of the Greek Church is not marked by bloody tribunals of orthodoxy, like the Spanish Inquisition, or systematic and long-continued persecution, like the crusades against the Waldenses, Albigenes, Huguenots, with the infernal scenes of St. Bartholomew and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, and the Eastern Church of old has mercilessly expelled and exiled Arian, Nestorian, Eutychian, and other heretics, persecuted the Paulicians (885); and modern Russia rigidly prohibits secession from the orthodox national Church. Nobody can be converted in Russia from one religion or sect to another, except to the national orthodox Church; and all the children of mixed marriages, where one parent belongs to it, must be baptized and educated in it. The spirit of fanatical intolerance has manifested itself recently in the atrocious persecution of the Jews (1881), which excited the indignation of the civilized world; but it would be unfair to hold the Eastern Church responsible for these excesses. A church which has been wonderfully preserved through so many centuries, and allows the word of God to circulate among her people, justifies a hopeful view of its future mission and prospects.

LIT.—The chief sources are the acts of the first seven ecumenical synods; the writings of the Greek fathers, especially Athanasius, Chrysostom, John of Damascus, and Photius; the Confession of Gennadius, Patriarch of Constantinople (delivered to the Turkish Sultan, Mahomet II., 1453); the orthodox Confession of Peter Mogilas, metropolitan of Kief (1643); the eighteen decrees of the synod of Jerusalem, or the Con- fection of Osiandros (1672, mainly directed against the Patriarch Cyril Lucar, and his attempt to Protestantize the Greek Church); the Russian catechisms of Platon, and especially of Philaret (metropolitan of Moscow, d. 1687). The Longer Catechism of Philaret, issued by authority of the holy synod of St. Petersburg, 1839, is used in all the churches and schools of the Russian Empire, and is far the best modern exposition of the orthodox doctrine of the Eastern Church. It contains, in question and answer, a Catechism of the Nicene Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Nine Beatitudes, and the Ten Commandments. The creeds of the Greek Church, see in KIMMEL: Monumenta Fidei Ecclesiae Orientalis, Jena, 1843-50, 2 vols.; and in SCHAFF: Creeds of Chris- tendom, vol. ii.; comp. also vol. i. pp. 46 sqq. Mod- ern Works.—Leo Allatius (a convert to Rome, who endeavored to Romanize the Greek Church), on the consent of the Greek and Latin churches (Col., 1848); Le Quien: Oriens Christianus, 1740; Jac. Goar: Euchologium, s. Rituale Gracum, 1807; John King: Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia, London, 1772; John Mason Neale: History of the Holy Eastern Church, London, 1850; Dean Stanley: Lectures on the Eastern Church, London and New York, 1861 (3d ed., 1886); Gass: Symbolik der griech. Kirche, 1872. On the Russo-Greek Church, see also the works of Strahl, Mouraviieff, Pinkerton, Blackmore (The Doctrine of the Russian Church, 1863), Haas, Blackmore (Geschichte Russlands, 1872), Basaroff, Boissard (L'eglise de Russie, 1870, 2 vols.). Lectures 11 and 12 of Dean Stanley's work on the Eastern Church, and espe- cially Wallace: Russia, N. Y., 1875; Harneck: Statistik d. is not discussed (Materials zur Geschichte Russlands, 1875), 1879; the articles on the Greek Church by Schaff, in Johnson's Cyclopaedia, by
GREENFIELD, William, a celebrated linguist; b. in London, April 1, 1799; d. there Nov. 5, 1831. He edited, for Bagster, the Comprehensiva Bible (1826), the Syriac New Testament (1829, 1829), a Hebrew New Testament (1830), a lexicon of the Greek New Testament, and an abridgment of Schmidt's Greek Concordance. He was appointed in 1830 editor of foreign versions to the British and Foreign Bible Society. See his Life, by J. H. Jones, published New York, 1849.

GREGG, John, D.D., b. at Cape Breton, County Clare, Ireland, Aug. 4, 1798; d. at Cork, Sunday, May 26, 1878. He was educated at the University of Dublin; after service in a country parish, was rector in Dublin, 1836-62; in 1857 he was made Archdeacon of Kildare, and in 1862 Bishop of Cork, Cloyne, and Ross. In each capacity he did good service. His ministry in Dublin was memorable for reason of his spirituality, eloquence, and fidelity; while as a bishop he was wise in counsel, kind in manner, and firm in rule. See his Life (sermons and lectures), Lond., 1883, and his Life by his son, Dublin, 1878:

GREMLAND, See Boyle, HANS.

GREENLAND. See EGEDE, HANS.

GREENO, Joseph Henry, F.R.S., D.C.L., author of The Spiritual Philosophy; b. in London, Nov. 1, 1799; d. at the Mount, Hadley, Middlesex, Dec. 13, 1863. He was by profession a surgeon, and achieved the highest success; but he devoted much time to philosophical studies. In 1817 he made the acquaintance of Coleridge, and became a most daily companion. Coleridge, who died July 5, 1854, made him his literary executor; and in 1856 Mr. Green resigned his professorship of surgery at King's College, London, retired from practice, and spent the rest of his life in studious seclusion. Shortly before his death he finished the work by which he will be remembered, — The Spiritual Philosophy, founded on the Teaching of the Late Samuel Taylor Coleridge (London, 1856, 2 vols.). The work was carried through the press by Mr. John Simon, who prefaced it with a brief Memoir. It is the best concastenated exposition of Coleridge's philosophy. Mr. Green was a man of lovely character.

GREENFIELD, William, a celebrated linguist; b. in London, April 1, 1799; d. there Nov. 5, 1831. He edited, for Bagster, the Comprehensiva Bible (1826), the Syriac New Testament (1829, 1829), a Hebrew New Testament (1830), a lexicon of the Greek New Testament, and an abridgment of Schmidt's Greek Concordance. He was appointed in 1830 editor of foreign versions to the British and Foreign Bible Society. See his Life, by J. H. Jones, published New York, 1849.

GREENHILL, William, one of the “dissenting brethren” at the Westminster Assembly (1643); was b. in Oxfordshire; entered Oxford 1604; became minister at Stepney before 1643; cast out of his living by the Act of Uniformity; d. before 1677. His Exposition of Ezekiel, in five volumes (London, 1645-52, new edition by Sherman, London, 1839) of an average of 600 pages each, is one of the best Puritan commentaries. See REID: Memoirs of the Westminster Divines, 1811.

GREEK VERSIONS. See Bible Versions.

GREEN, Ashbel, D.D., L.L.D., an ecclesiastical leader in the Presbyterian Church of the United States, and the first bishop of that denomination. His Life, by Genesee, HANS.

GREGOR VON HEIMBURG was b. in Herzog (v. 409-430), by T. M. LINDSEY, in the Encyclopaedia Britannica (vol. XI. 154-156), and Calvinic, by Leibnitz. see the arts: BULGARIA, GREECE, RUSSIA, TURKEY. PHILIP SCHAPP.

GREGOR VON HEIMBURG. See Gregor von Heimburg.

GREGOR, Ashbel, D.D., b. at Hanover, N.J., July 6, 1762; d. at Philadelphia, May 19, 1848. He served as a sergeant in the Revolutionary war; graduated at Princeton 1783; and was successively tutor and professor at the college, and pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia from 1787 to 1812. He was one of the founders of Princeton Seminary, and president of the college 1812-22. He afterwards resided in Philadelphia, editing the Christian Advocate 1822-34. Dr. Green excelled as a leader, and was born to command. "In any sphere or calling he would have held a high rank. As a statesman, he could have shaped the policy of his party, if not of his country," etc. (Gillett, Hist.-Presb. Ch., I. 566 sq.). He wielded great influence in the Presbyterian Church, and by his arraignment of Albert Barnes (first when the congregation appeared before the presbytery of Philadelphia, to get permission to hold fundamental views with respect to social reforms, but opposed, often with great courage, the reign of terror. He was the first French priest who took the oath on the constitution (Dec. 27, 1790). His episcopal office he resigned, in consequence of the concordat of 1801. During the Restoration he was much persecuted by the ultramontanists; and Guillon had to suffer considerably because he administered the sacrament to him on his deathbed. He wrote Sur la régence (Ies Jules (Metz, 1789, translated into English. London, same year), De la littérature-des Noyers (Paris, 1808, translated both into English and German), Histoire des sectes religieuses (Paris, 1828, 5 vols.), Memoires de Grégoire (Paris, 1837, 2 vols.). See his life, by Krüger, Leip., 1838; Maggioro, Nancy, 1865; C. Ranz, GREGORY: Grégoire, the Priest and the Revolutionist, Leip., 1876. CASPAR RENÉ GREGORY.

GREENLAND. See EGEDE, HANS.

GREGORY: Gre'goire, the Priest and the Revolutionist, Leip., 1876.
Theodoric of Cologne, and Archbishop Jacob of Treves, on account of the reformatory tendencies their government evinced. The electors of the empire immediately assembled at Francfort; and, supported by the Emperor Frederic III., they sent an embassy to Rome to move the Pope to cancel the depositions. Gregor stood at the head of this embassy; and, when nothing came of the negotiations, he published his *Admonitio de injustis usurpationibus paparum*, etc. (Goldast, Monarchia, I. p. 557), burning with indignation. In 1458 his friend Enea Silvio ascended the papal throne under the name of Pius II.; and in the very next year Gregor had an opportunity to plead before him, as the representative of Duke Sigismund of Austria, at the congress of Mantua. But Gregor spoke against the Pope's plans, and the friendship turned into a deadly hatred. Shortly after, the duke was put under the ban, because he had imprisoned Nicholas of Cusa, Bishop of Brixen; and when Gregor, in behalf of his client, appealed to an ocumenic council, he, too, was put under the ban. He sought refuge, first with George Podiebrad, king of Bohemia, afterwards with the Duke of Saxony; and he continued to harass the curia with his scornful and defiant denunciations. After the accession, however, of Sixtus IV., the ban was abrogated; and he died (1472) reconciled with the Church.

Lit. — Besides those of his writings which are found in Goldast (Monarchia), there is a collection, *Scripta necroes*, etc., Francfort, 1608. His life was written by Ballenstadius (Hein-städt, 1737) and C. Brockhaus (Leipzig, 1801). See also Voigt: *Enea Silvio Piccolomini, 1858—63*, 3 vols. P. Tschackert.

**GREGORIAN CHANT.** See Music.

**GREGORIUS AGRIGENTINUS** was Bishop of Agrigentum in the latter part of the sixth century, and wrote (in Greek) a commentary on Ecclesiasties, which, together with a life of him (also in Greek) by Leontius, was edited by Morcelli, Venice, 1791, with Latin translation and notes, and reproduced in Patrologia Graeca, vol. 98. Though the sketch by Leontius is very full, the chronology of Gregory's life is very uncertain.

**GREGORIUS ANTIQUIUS** was a monk in Constantinople, then abbot of the monastery of Mount Sinai, and finally patriarch of Antioch, or, as the city was then called, Theopolis (589—594). His life was written by Ballenstadius (Hein-städt, 1737) and C. Brockhaus (Leipzig, 1801). See also Voigt: *Enea Silvio Piccolomini, 1858—63*, 3 vols. P. Tschackert.

**GREGORIAN CHANT.** See Music.

**GREGORIUS AGRIGENTINUS**, was Bishop of Agrigentum in the latter part of the sixth century, and wrote (in Greek) a commentary on Ecclesiastes, which, together with a life of him (also in Greek) by Leontius, was edited by Morcelli, Venice, 1791, with Latin translation and notes, and reproduced in Patrologia Graeca, vol. 98. Though the sketch by Leontius is very full, the chronology of Gregory's life is very uncertain.

**GREGORIUS ANTIQUIUS** was a monk in Constantinople, then abbot of the monastery of Mount Sinai, and finally patriarch of Antioch, or, as the city was then called, Theopolis (589—594). His life was written by Ballenstadius (Hein-städt, 1737) and C. Brockhaus (Leipzig, 1801). See also Voigt: *Enea Silvio Piccolomini, 1858—63*, 3 vols. P. Tschackert.

**GREGORIAN CHANT.** See Music.

**GREGORIUS AGRIGENTINUS**, was Bishop of Agrigentum in the latter part of the sixth century, and wrote (in Greek) a commentary on Ecclesiastes, which, together with a life of him (also in Greek) by Leontius, was edited by Morcelli, Venice, 1791, with Latin translation and notes, and reproduced in Patrologia Graeca, vol. 98. Though the sketch by Leontius is very full, the chronology of Gregory's life is very uncertain.

**GREGORIUS ANTIQUIUS** was a monk in Constantinople, then abbot of the monastery of Mount Sinai, and finally patriarch of Antioch, or, as the city was then called, Theopolis (589—594). His life was written by Ballenstadius (Hein-städt, 1737) and C. Brockhaus (Leipzig, 1801). See also Voigt: *Enea Silvio Piccolomini, 1858—63*, 3 vols. P. Tschackert.

**GREGORIUS AGRIGENTINUS**, was Bishop of Agrigentum in the latter part of the sixth century, and wrote (in Greek) a commentary on Ecclesiastes, which, together with a life of him (also in Greek) by Leontius, was edited by Morcelli, Venice, 1791, with Latin translation and notes, and reproduced in Patrologia Graeca, vol. 98. Though the sketch by Leontius is very full, the chronology of Gregory's life is very uncertain.

**GREGORIUS ANTIQUIUS** was a monk in Constantinople, then abbot of the monastery of Mount Sinai, and finally patriarch of Antioch, or, as the city was then called, Theopolis (589—594). His life was written by BallenstADIUS (Leipzig, 1880). W. MOLLER.

**GREGORY NAZIANZEN.** See Armenia.

**GREGORY NAZIANZEN**, one of the three celebrated Cappodocians of the fourth century who defended the Nicene faith, and one of the most eloquent orators of the early church. Compared with his two other fellow-countrymen, he was neither an ecclesiastical leader, like Basil, nor a deep thinker, like Gregory of Nyssa, but surpassed both in rhetorical skill, and possessed a combination of talents such as neither of them had. A romantic interest attaches to his career, which moved to and fro between active participation in the enterprises of the church, and the free leisure of a Christian philosopher and monk, as monasticism then allowed. Rich biographical notices are found in Gregory the Presbyter, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Rufinus, and Suidas. The most important sources of his life are, however, his own writings. He was b. 330, at Nazianzus in Cappadocia, or in Ariazas, a village near by, and d. 389 or 390. His mother, Nonna, was a woman of ardent piety and devotion. Brought into the Church by her persuasions, his father was made Bishop of Nazianzus. Gregory visited, in turn, the two Caesareas, Alexandria, and Athens; devoting himself in the latter city to the study of grammar, mathematics, rhetoric; and among his four fellow-students was Julian, afterwards Roman emperor. In 360 he returned to Cappadocia, and was baptized. At the invitation of his friend Basil he went to Pontus, and shared with him common studies and diversions. One result of these mutual studies was the *Philologia*, a collection of excerpts from Origen. His father, yielding to the pressure of imperial and ecclesiastical influence, had affixed his signature to a semi-Arian document of the synod of Rimini. Hearing of this, Gregory hurried to Nazianzus, and prevailed on him to retract. On this visit his father, as was frequently the case in those days, suddenly and without previous intimation to his son, ordained him presbyter. Gregory shrank from the duties of the office, and fled to Basil, but was soon prevailed upon to return, and assist his father in his old age. When Basil was consecrated Bishop of Cesarea some years afterward, he intrusted to his friend the bishopric of Caesarea; and on the day of consecration of his successor, he was forced upon Gregory against his will; and, though he allowed himself to be consecrated, he refused to serve, and continued to assist his father.
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as coadjutor till his death (374). In 379 he was called to Constantinople to lead the Nicene party, which was so inconsiderable that it did not even have a church to worship in. But Gregory's eloquence and devotion soon attracted crowds, who, under the spell of his words, forgot his smallness of stature and sickly emaciation of face. Even those who were opposed to him were moved by the beauty of his sentiment, and the little congregation soon passed into a church, which, with reference to the revival of the true faith, received the name Anastasia. In 380 Theodotius consummated the defeat of the Arian party; and Gregory was led in triumph into the principal city of the church. He was elected Bishop of Constantinople, and consecrated by the order of the second ecumenical council (381). But the Macedonian and Egyptian bishops on their arrival pronounced the act a violation of the canons of Nica, which limited a bishop to one diocese. Gregory resigned, too able to have recourse to intrigue, as was then so frequently the case, and yet not without some regret. He returned to Cappadocia, where for a time he devoted himself to ecclesiastical matters, and then retired to his paternal estate at Arianzus.

Gregory's Writings consist of orations, letters, and poems. In these he shows himself a skilful author: his diction is rich, and glowing with figures, his emotion ardent, his rhetorical gifts shedding a constant lustre. His letters, addressed to Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, etc., abound in beautiful thoughts. His poems contain some fine choruses, and are often sonorous and prolix. Most important are the orations, forty-five in number. Five are devoted to the exposition and defence of the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity, and won for Gregory the title of "Theologian." The others are devoted to public events, or to the memory of martyrs, friends, and kindred. No one of them is a pure treatise of a biblical subject. In christology Gregory opposed Arianism and Apollinarianism: in anthropology he teaches original sin, and derives the mortality of man from the fall. But he held to the ability of the human will to choose the good, and to the cooperation of man with God in these particulars he shows the influence of Origen, as, in his views of the Trinity, the influence of Athanasius.

LIT. — The first edition of his works by Her- 
vagius, Basil, 1550. The best edition is that of the BENEDICTINES, Paris, 1778-1840 (its progress was interrupted by the French Revolution). This edition contains the annotations of Nicetas, Elisa, and Psellus, and is introduced with a Life by CLEMECECT; [H. Hurter, ed. Gregory's Oratio apologetica de fuga sua leisntruc, 1879]; ULL- 
MAN: Gorgorius i. Nazianz. d. Theolog., Darm- 
stadt, 1826; Eng. trans., G. F. COXE, 1837, an excellent monograph; BENGE: St. Grégoire de Naz., Paris, 1877; [GIBBON: Decline and Fall of Roman Empire, chap. xvii.; SMITH and WACK, Dict. Christ. Biog.].

GABB.

GREGORY OF NYSSA, one of the ablest defenders of the Nicene faith against Arianism and Apollinarism, and of the brother of Basil; was b. in Cappadocia about 332; d. about 395. He was indebted to his brother for his literary training. Under the influence of a dream he undertook the office of anagnorst, or reader; but, the duties not being congenial to his tastes, he forsook it to become a teacher of rhetoric. Gregory Nazianzen demonstrating with him for seeming to prefer the fame of a rhetorician above the calling of a Christian, he returned to the service of the Church, and in 371 or 372 was made, by Basil, Bishop of Nyssa, an inconsiderable town of Cappadocia. Gregory was married to Theodosia, who was his cousin, and the son of his promotion. The synod of Ancyras (375), convened by the Arian Demetrius, governor of Pontus, pronounced him, though unjustly, guilty of misuse of church-funds, and violation of the canons for the election of bishops. In the following year another synod deposed him from his bishopric. This was followed by his banishment by Valens. Crushed by these events, Gregory retired into solitude. The death of Valens (378) was the signal for his return to his diocese, which he entered amidst the acclamations of the people. The following year Basil died, and a few months later his sister Macrina, whom Gregory saw on her dying hours on his return from the synod of Antioch. In 381 we find him at the Council of Constantinople. At this meeting he read his works against Eunomius to Gregory Nazianzen and Jerome. Of the two discourses he pronounced during his stay in the city,— at the consecration of Gregory Nazianzen, Bishop of Constantinople, and at the death of Miletius of Antioch,— the latter only is preserved. The council appointed him, in conjunction with Heladius, overseer or patriarch of the churches of Pontus; but he seems to have been ignored by the latter. In obedience to an order of the synod of Antioch (or the Council of Constantinople), Gregory visited the church of Arabia (Babylon) in the interest of its reformation. He afterwards went to Jerusalem, where he found the church in a very unsatisfactory state. A result of this tour was the work De Eunibis Hierosolyma, which warns against the uselessness and evils of pilgrimages. He was in Constantinople in 383, and again in 385, when he delivered funeral orations over the young Princess Pulcheria and the Empress Placilla. We hear nothing more of him till 394, when he attended at a synod of Constantinople, and delivered a sermon at the dedication of a church at Chalecedon.

Gregory of Nyssa was of a retiring disposition, and laid himself open, by his irresolute and pliant administration of his diocese, to the charge of weakness and incompetence from Basil. He lacked the practical gifts of a leader, which his brother possessed in an eminent degree, and was not endowed so richly with oratorical talents as Gregory Nazianzen; but he was a profounder theologian than either. In general, except on the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, he leaned upon Origen. In his vindication of the Nicene articles he makes a clear distinction between essence (οὐσία) and person (τιματος). The simplicity of the divine essence excludes all subordination of persons in the Trinity. The Son is equal with the Father by reason of an eternal generation. Sin has interfered with the realization of man's design, which was to participate in the divine fulness, and has antagonized the world to God. To enable man to realize this design is the object of the Incarnation. Man still retains free will and a love for the good, which is inde-
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GREGORY OF Utrecht, the son of Alberic, who, through his mother, Wastrade, was related to the royal family of the Merovingians; met in 722 with Boniface in the monastery of Pfalzel, near Treves, and became from that day his friend and companion. After the death of Boniface he was charged by the Pope with the conversion of the Frisians; and he labored with success for this object, both as a missionary, and as leader of the school of Utrecht. He died in the Church of St. Salvador, in Utrecht, Aug. 25, 775. His life, by his pupil, Liudger, is found in Act. Sancl., August V.

G. PLITT.

GREGORY is the name of sixteen popes; namely, G. of Antioch, the Great (Sept. 3, 590, March 12, 604), descended from a distinguished senatorial family, probably the Anicians, and was b. in Rome between 540 and 550. Educated in conformity with his social state, he was instructed in dialectics and rhetoric, studied law, entered the civil service, gained the confidence of the Emperor Justin, and received (about 574) the dignity of a prætor urbis. But he also studied the Fathers of the Western Church, — Augustine, Ambrose, and Jerome. His family was markedly religious: his mother, Sylvia, and his two paternal aunts, have been canonized. The deepest instincts of his own nature revolted against the luxury and ambition of his office. He determined to flee from the world, and become a monk. He employed the immense wealth left to him by his father's death to found six Benedictine monasteries in Sicily, and a seventh in his own house in Rome. In the latter he became a monk himself; and so severe were the ascetic exercises he practised, that his health became impaired, and even his life was in danger. At this moment the Pope, Pelagius II., interfered, dragged him out of the monastery by ordaining him a deacon (579), and raising him to the purple as Gregory II. The mission he fulfilled with great ability; and while in Constantinople he began his celebrated work Expositio in Job or moralium Libri XXXV. After his return to Rome (585) he continued to take a leading part in all the business of the curia; and after the death of Pelagius II. he was unanimously elected Pope, by the clergy, the senate, and the people, and compelled to accept.

The position of the Bishop of Rome was at that time by no means an easy one. Pressed on one side by the Arian and half-barbarian Lombards, he was not free on the other, but had to yield in many ways to the authority of the Byzantine emperor and his representative in Italy, the exarch of Ravenna. Nevertheless, the position was not without its opportunities; and Gregory knew how to utilize them. The Pope was the greatest landed proprietor in Italy. From his estates, not only in Campania, Apulia, Calabria, Sicily, and Sardinia, but also in Gaul, Dalmatia, and Northern Africa, immense sums flowed into his treasury; and Gregory proved an excellent administrator, strict, and with an eye for the minutest details. To this wealth was added a...
certain prestige not ecclesiastical. On account of the weakness and inability of the exarchs, the Pope became the real ruler of Rome; and this rôle was quite natural to Gregory, who had been pra tor urbis before he became Pope. Thus he stood almost as an independent power, mediat ing between the Lombards and the Byzantines. Through Theodelinda, a Bavarian princess, belonging to the Orthodox Church, and the wife of King Agilulf, he exercised some influence on the Lombards; though at one time (593), just while he was delivering his homilies on Ezekiel, he had to buy off Agilulf from the gates of Rome with an immense sum of gold and silver. In Constantinople, too, he could give his voice some weight; though his relations with the Emperor Mauri tius became more and more troubled, especially after the controversy with John Jejunator. John IV., Patriarch of Constantinople, liked to call himself the "ecumenical patriarch." But he was neither the first to assume this title, nor the only one to whom it had been applied: his predecessor, Menas, had borne it 536; and it had been given to Leo I. by the Council of Chal cedon 451, to Hormisdas by the Syrian monks 517, and to Boniface II. by the metropolitan of Larissa in 531. Gregory, however, who called himself servus servorum Dei (not as a rebuke to his predecessor, Menas, but simply in imitation of Augustine), took umbrage at this title, complained of it to Mauritius (596), and attacked John IV. with a somewhat extraordinary vehemence. John died in the same year; but his successor, Cyrus, continued the title, and Gregory became more and more irritated, especially as Mauri tius declined to interfere. In November, 602, Mauritius was overthrown by Phocas; and not only was he himself beheaded, but also his wife, his five sons, and his three daughters. The new emperor, however, the usurper, the murderer, was hailed by the Pope with letters of congratulation, whose fulsome ness and flattery and adulation can be explained only on the supposition that Gregory, when he wrote the letters, was ignorant of the wanton cruelty which had accompanied the usurpation,—a sup position which, in view of the times, by no means is improbable.

In a similar way his relation to Brunehild must be explained. Brunehild was simply a monster. The crimes she committed during the reign of her son, Childebert II. (575-596), and her two grandsons, Theudebert II. and Theuderic II., earned for her the name of the "Frankish Fury," the "new Jezebel." And to this woman Gregory wrote letters full of praise and flattery. But what did he know of her? Probably nothing more than he learnt from her own letters; and in these she simply asked for some relics for a church, or the pallium for St. Syagrius of Autun, or a privilege for some monastery, or a papal legate to a Frankish synod; while she promised to support the English mission, to build churches and monasteries, to abolish simony, to introduce offices and benefices to laen, etc. To him Brunehild may have looked as he described her.—a very pious woman.

The two brightest points, however, in Gregory's relations with foreign countries, are Spain and England. Through the influence of Bishop Leander of Seville, an intimate friend of Gregory since they first met in Constantinople, Recce red, King of the Visigoths, was led to abandon Arianism, and join the Catholics. In a letter dated 506, the king communicated his conversion to the Pope; and at the same time he sent a goblet of gold as a present to St. Peter. Gregory answered most graciously, and sent abbot Cyriacus to Spain with the pallium to Leander. The synod of Barcelona, held in the same year under the presidency of the metropolitan Asiaticus of Tarragona, and treating the questions of simony and laymen's investiture with ecclesiastical bene fices, was probably connected with the sending of Cyriacus. England had already attracted the attention of Gregory while he was yet a monk. The sight of the Anglo-Saxon boys exhibited in the slave-markets of Rome had moved him to pity, and he determined to go to England as a missionary. He actually started on the way, but was recalled by the Pope. When he became Pope himself, he sent (596) Augustine and forty other monks to King Ethelbert of Kent; and already the next year Augustine could report the baptism of the king and ten thousands of his subjects. How great an interest Gregory took in the English mission appears from his letters to Augustine, which are full of the most detailed instructions.

However successful Gregory was in extending the influence and authority of the Roman see throughout the Western countries, that which he accomplished for the internal organization and consolidation of the Church was, nevertheless, of far greater importance. The delicate question of the dependence of the Western metropolitan sees on the see of Rome, he handled with great adroitness. In North Africa, whose clergy were extremely jealous of their independence, he acted with great caution, and in strict conformity with the canons of the Council of Sardica (347). Gennadius the exact, and the two most prominent bishops in the provinces, Dominicus of Car thage, and Columbus of Numidia, were firm friends of his; and many appeals were made to the Roman see. But the parties were never summoned to Rome: the cases were treated in loco, and by papal legates. Quite otherwise in the diocese of Ravenna. He forbade the Archbishop John, in a rather sharp manner, to wear the pallium, except when celebrating mass; and when a conflict arose between John's successor, Marinianus, and a certain abbot, Claudius, he summoned both parties to Rome to plead their cause before him personally. He attempted the same in Illyria, on occasion of a contested episcopal election at Salona (593); but in that case the Emperor Mauritius interfered, and to his great chagrin and humiliation he was compelled to make a compromise.

Gregory's ideas of a papal supremacy may have been somewhat vague; but his instincts were strong, and pointed always towards the loftiest goal. Very characteristic in this respect were his exertions to separate the monks from the clergy proper. He had been a monk himself, and he knew to what temptations and illusions human nature is exposed by monastic life: consequently he fixed the term of the novitiate at...
two years, and for soldiers at three. He forbade
youths under eighteen years to enter a monastery,
and married men, unless with the consent of their
wives. He ordered all ecclesiastical officials to
seize those monks, who, often in great swarms,
roamed about in the country, and really were
neither more nor less than tramps of the most
indolent and impertinent description, and to de-
lever them up to the nearest monastery for pun-
ishment. Thus he did much for the reform of
the monks, but he did still more for their eman-
cipation. One monastery after the other was
exempted from the episcopal authority; and at
the synod of Rome (801) the power of the bishop
over the abbeys was generally confined to the
installation of the abbot. It was evidently his
idea to form out of the monks a powerful instru-
ment which might be wielded by the Pope inde-
pendently of the clergy. On the other hand, he
transferred some of the most marked characteris-
tics of monastic life to the clergy, as, for instance,
the celibacy, for whose introduction he was ex-
ceedingly anxious. For the clergy he wrote,
shortly after his accession to the papal throne,
his famous book, *Regula Pastoralis,* which, for
centuries was regarded as the moral code of the
clergy. The Emperor Mauritius had it translated
into Greek (Alfred the Great translated it him-
self into Anglo-Saxon), and Hincmar of Rheims
states in 870 that every Frankish bishop took an
oath on it at his consecration. Preaching he con-
 sidered as the principal duty of the priest, and he
gave in this respect a brilliant example himself.
Besides the above-mentioned homilies on Ezekiel,
fifty homilies on the Gospels have come down
to us.

As a theologian Gregory was without original-
ity: nevertheless he exercised also in this field a
beneficial influence by spreading the interest in
Augustine. He is sometimes called the "in-
v en tor of purgatory;" but, though his doctrines
of an intermediate state between death and doom
(Dionysius Sammarthanus, Paris, 1705, 4 vols. fol.)
are very explicit, they are hardly more than
worded editions are those by Dom Denis de Ste.
Marthe (Lyons, 1740; G. Lav, Leipzig, 1845; G.
Prunes, Francfort, 1744; F. Bernardi: *J. Longobardi,
* s. Greg. M., Milan, 1843; Guettier: *La papauté
moderne ... Greg. le Grand, Paris, 1861; [G.
Maggiolo: *Prolegomeni alla storia di Greg. il grande
e de' suoi tempi, Prato, 1879].

Gregory II. (May 10, 715—Feb. 10, 731) was a
Benedictine monk, and rebuilt Monte Cassino,
which had been destroyed by the Lombards. He
was the first Pope who addressed himself to the
Franks for aid against the Lombards, but he did
not succeed. His letters are found in Jaffé:
Pont.,* II.—*Gregory III. (Feb. 11, 731—Nov. 28,
741) was a Syrian by birth. He, too, asked the
Franks for aid against the Lombards, but with as
little success as his predecessor. A work he
wrote, according to Anastasius, on the legitimacy
of image-worship, seems to have been lost.—

Gregory IV. (827—844) was, by his ambition to
act as a divinely appointed arbiter, led to inter-
fere in the dismal family troubles of the Frankish
dynasty, and became, perhaps unwillingly and
unwittingly, the tool with which Lothaire ac-
complished his treachery on the fields of Colmar.
His life is found in *Vignoli: Lib. Pont.,* III.—

Gregory V. (May 3, 996—Feb. 18, 999) was a
son of Duke Otho of Carinthia, and a near relative of
Otho III.; was the first German pope. He
was placed on the throne by Otho III.; but the em-
peror had hardly left Italy before the Roman
nobility rose in rebellion, headed by Crescentius,
and an antipope (John XVI.) was elected. But
when the emperor returned, the rebellion was uelled,
and an antipope (John XVI.) was elected. But
Crescentius was beheaded, and John XVI. was
dragged through the streets of Rome, mutilated,

Gregory VI. (1044—46) bought the papal crown
from Benedict IX., and ruled for a year and a
half with prudence and tolerable success. But
he did not please the Roman nobility, and they
allured Benedict IX. to return. The emperor,
Henry III., was called in as arbiter; and Gregory
VI. met him at Piacenza, and accompanied him
to Sutri. There he openly confessed in the coun-
cill that he had bought the papal dignity in order
to save it; and, when all the bishops agreed in
condemning such a measure, he laid aside the
papal insignia, and went with the emperor to
Germany, where he died at Cologne, 1048.—

There was also an antipope of the name, Gregory
VI., under Benedict VIII., but only for a short
time. E. Schmitz: *Murburg. Chron.,* in *Perz:
Mon. Germ. Script.*

Gregory VII. (April 22, 1073—May 25, 1085).
His true name was Hildebrand; and he was born
of humble parentage, either at Siena or in Rome.
He was chaplain to Gregory VI., accompanied
him on his journey to Cologne, and entered, after his death, the monastery of Cluny. There Leo IX. became acquainted with him in the time of the synod of Rheims (1049). He returned to Italy, was made a deacon and cardinal, and soon he became the very soul of the papal government. A man of lofty spirit and inexhaustible energy, he knew how to avail himself of every chance in the world as rung from his brain, and were set a-work by his hands.

A man of lofty spirit and inexhaustible energy, he became the very soul of the papal government. One of the first measures of Nicholas II. was a decree by which the papal election was put entirely into the hands of the cardinals and the German emperor, to the exclusion of the Roman nobility. Nicholas II. died in 1061. One party among the cardinals immediately sent the papal insignia to the Empress Agnes in order that she should appoint a new pope; while another party, headed by Hildebrand, assembled in a regular council, and chose Bishop Anselm of Lucca, who assumed the name of Alexander II., Oct. 1, 1061. The empress chose Bishop Cadalus of Parma, Oct. 21; and at the head of an imperial army he entered Rome. But in May, 1062, a revolution in Germany bereft the Empress Agnes of her power, and placed Archbishop Anno of Cologne at the head of the government during the minority of Henry IV. By the Councils of Augsburg (October, 1062) and Mautua (May, 1064), Alexander II. was recognized as the legitimate Pope.

Alexander II. died April 22, 1073; and the very same day Hildebrand was elected pope. He assumed the name of Gregory VII., and was consecrated June 29, 1073. But the consent of the German emperor was not asked for: indeed, the relation between Gregory VII. and Henry IV. was from the very beginning strained, and fraught with danger to them both. The abbey of Reichenau on the Lake of Constance, became vacant in 1071; and a monk (Robert of Bamberg) got himself appointed abbot by bribing the councilors of the king. But the monks of Reichenau denounced the new abbot in Rome, and Alexander II. put him under the ban. As now the royal councilors would not give up the estates they had received from Robert, they, too, were put under the ban, as the king would not dismiss his councilors, even he fell under the ban. Such was the state of affairs when Gregory VII. ascended the throne. By the mediation, however, of the Empress Agnes, a reconciliation was effect ed. Henry IV. humiliated himself, did penance, and asked for absolution and peace. For some time while the contest went on, he lived as a beggar, clad in sackcloth, with bare feet, and ashes on his head, in the courtyard, and was, after three days' waiting, admitted to the pope's presence, and absolved. The German princes, fearing the revenge of Henry IV., chose an antipope, March 15, 1077; and a war began which lasted till 1080. During these years, Gregory VII. constantly urged the convocation of a diet,
in which he himself would adjust matters; and, when he discovered that Henry never would consent to appear before such an assembly, he put him a second time under the ban, in the spring of 1089. But Oct. 15, in the battle on the Elster, he succeeded in defeating the anti-king, and suppressing the rebellion; and in the spring of 1091 he triumphed in Italy at the head of a great army, having in the mean time made Clement III. anti-pope. He besieged Rome four years in succession, occupied the Leonine part of the city, and shut the Pope up in the castle of St. Angelo; but he was finally driven away by Robert Guiscard, who rescued Gregory VII., and brought him to Salerno, where he died. See GuIBERT O.F. PARMA.


Cacci, 3d ed., Rome, 1885.]

FLOTO: Gregory VIII. (Oct. 21-Dec. 17, 1187). There was also an antipope of that name, Mauritius Burdinus, Archbishop of Braga, raised to the papal throne by the Camaldolensians; since 1826 prefect of Salerno, where he died. See Goraaar or GREGORY, Olinthus Gilbert, b. at Yaxley, in which he himself would adjust matters; and, when he discovered that Henry never would consent to appear before such an assembly, he put him a second time under the ban, in the spring of 1089. But Oct. 15, in the battle on the Elster, he succeeded in defeating the anti-king, and suppressing the rebellion; and in the spring of 1091 he triumphed in Italy at the head of a great army, having in the mean time made Clement III. anti-pope. He besieged Rome four years in succession, occupied the Leonine part of the city, and shut the Pope up in the castle of St. Angelo; but he was finally driven away by Robert Guiscard, who rescued Gregory VII., and brought him to Salerno, where he died. See GuIBERT O.F. PARMA.


Cacci, 3d ed., Rome, 1885.]

FLOTO: Gregory VIII. (Oct. 21-Dec. 17, 1187). There was also an antipope of that name, Mauritius Burdinus, Archbishop of Braga, raised to the papal throne by the Camaldolensians; since 1826 prefect of Salerno, where he died. See Goraaar or
professor of mathematics at the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich, 1807, where he died, Feb. 2, 1841. He is noted religiously for his Lives of Robert Hall (prefixed to a collected edition of Hall's works, separately published 1838) and John Mason Good (1826), and for his Letters to a Friend on the Evidence, Doctrines, and Duties of the Christian Religion (1815, 2 vols., 9th ed., 1851, abridgment, 1858).

GRELET, Stephen (Étienne de), b. at Limo- ges, France, Nov. 2, 1773; d. at Burlington, N.J., Nov. 16, 1855. Born in the French nobility, at seventeen he was one of the royal body-guard. After a variety of adventures, he landed in New York 1795, in which year he was converted, and joined the Society of Friends. His ministrations during the yellow-fever visitation in Philadelphia, 1798, revealed his rare qualities. He rose to great eminence, and acquired wealth. He felt called upon to preach, and to this end made long journeys through the United States, and even to Europe, which he visited several times. On one occasion, being presented to the Pope, he had the courage to preach even in such a presence; similarly he exhorted the Czar of Russia. See Memoirs of Stephen Grelet, by B. Seebohm, Philadelphia, 1860, 2 vols.

GRESWELL, Edward, chronicler; b. at Den- ton, near Manchester, Eng., 1797; d. at Oxford, June 29, 1889. He was fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, 1823, and at the time of his death vice-principal. His works are valuable, and a prolific writer. His works, of which a good portion are in Latin, number over one hundred and fifty. Some of them are valuable; as, for instance, De Sancta Cruce; also his Greek grammar was much used. But he acquired his great fame principally by his obstinate and somewhat rude opposition to Protestantism.

GRIFFIN, Edward Dorr, a distinguished pulpi- tor, and president of Williams College; b. Jan. 6, 1770, at East Haddam, Conn.; d. Nov. 8, 1837, at Newark, N.J. He graduated with the highest honors, at Yale, 1790, and studied theology under Dr. Edwards, afterward president of Union College. In 1794 he accepted a call to the Congregational Church at Farmington; but the council having twice refused to ordain him, on account of alleged erroneous views on baptism and the doctrines of grace, he withdrew, with its consent, and in 1795 was installed pastor of a church in New Hartford. In 1801 he became the first incumbent of the chair of a church in New Hartford, and pastor in 1807. Here, as before in New Hartford, extensive revivals prevailed under his ministry. In 1809 he became the first incumbent of the chair of pulpit eloquence at Andover Seminary, which he exchanged for the pastorate of the Park Church, Boston, in 1811. In 1815 he returned to Newark as pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, and in 1821 was elected president of Williams College, holding the office till 1838.
powerful revival occurred in 1824. Dr. Griffin succeeded in putting the college on a firm basis. Dr. Griffin was one of the most eloquent preachers of his day. To a commanding presence was added a vivid imagination and fine reasoning powers. His sermons are simple, fervid, and evangelical. In theology he opposed the “New Divinity,” as it was called, of New Haven. He published Lectures delivered in Park-street Church, Boston, 1818; The Extent of the Atonement, New York, 1819. His Sermons, with Memoir of his Life, were edited by Dr. Sprague, in 2 vols., Albany, 1838. See also Cooke: Recollections of E. D. Griffin, Boston, 1860.

GRINDAL, Edmund, Archbishop of Canterbury; b. at St Bees about 1519; d. at Croyden, July 6, 1583. He was educated at Magdalen College, Cambridge, of which Dr. Ridley was master. In 1552 he was appointed chaplain to Ridley, who had become Bishop of London, and prebendary of Westminster. The year following he took refuge on the Continent, spending his time in labor subterranean. Part of his exile at Strasbourg and Frankfurt. Part of his time was occupied in labor tributary to Foxe’s Book of Martyrs. Returning to England, in 1558 he became master of Pembroke Hall, and, in 1560, Bishop of London. In 1570 he was, by Archbishop Parker’s influence, raised to the see of York, from which he was transferred, in 1576, to that of Canterbury. Grindal corresponded with the Reformers on the Continent, and was in sympathy with Puritanism (Dean Hook), at first determined to depose him from his archbishopric, but was satisfied with suspending him. A few months before his death she opened negotiations with him to resign his see. Grindal was a man of courteous and conciliatory spirit. His literary attainments were very extensive. He studied at Leiden; was appointed secretary to the king in 1277, and soon afterwards director of the royal archives; was, in the Dutch Parliament, the leader of the anti-revolutionary party, and opposed with great zeal the separation of State and Church, the emancipation of the school from the Church, etc. He was a Christian statesman, and occupied in Holland a position similar to that of Professor Stahl in Prussia. His idea that the Church ought to be the foundation and (rector scolarium), or chancellor, at Cambridge, 1843, in the Parker Society Series. STRYPE: Life and Acts of Abp. Grindal, 1710, Oxford, 1821; NXL: Hist. of Puritans, vol. I.; A Brief and True Account of Edm. Grindal, 1710; Hook: Lives of Abbys. of Canterbury, vol. V.

GROEN VAN PRINSTERER, Guillaume, b. in The Hague, Aug. 21, 1801; d. there May 19, 1876; studied at Leyden; was appointed secretary to the king in 1827, and soon afterwards director of the royal archives; was, in the Dutch Parliament, the leader of the anti-revolutionary party, and opposed with great zeal the separation of State and Church, the emancipation of the school from the Church, etc. He was a Christian statesman, and occupied in Holland a position similar to that of Professor Stahl in Prussia. His idea that the Church ought to be the foundation and (rector scolarium), or chancellor, at Cambridge, 1843, in the Parker Society Series. STRYPE: Life and Acts of Abp. Grindal, 1710, Oxford, 1821; NXL: Hist. of Puritans, vol. I.; A Brief and True Account of Edm. Grindal, 1710; Hook: Lives of Abbys. of Canterbury, vol. V.

GROEN VAN PRINSTERER, Guillaume, b. in The Hague, Aug. 21, 1801; d. there May 19, 1876; studied at Leyden; was appointed secretary to the king in 1827, and soon afterwards director of the royal archives; was, in the Dutch Parliament, the leader of the anti-revolutionary party, and opposed with great zeal the separation of State and Church, the emancipation of the school from the Church, etc. He was a Christian statesman, and occupied in Holland a position similar to that of Professor Stahl in Prussia. His idea that the Church ought to be the foundation and (rector scolarium), or chancellor, at Cambridge, 1843, in the Parker Society Series. STRYPE: Life and Acts of Abp. Grindal, 1710, Oxford, 1821; NXL: Hist. of Puritans, vol. I.; A Brief and True Account of Edm. Grindal, 1710; Hook: Lives of Abbys. of Canterbury, vol. V.

GROOT, Coert. See BRETHERN OF THE COMMON LIFE.

GROPPER, Johann, b. at Soest, February, 1592; d. in Rome, March, 1559; studied theology and canon law at Cologne, and was appointed, first canon, then archdeacon there. He was a reform friend of the Erasmian type; represented the conciliatory element at the deputations of Hagenau, Worms, and Regensburg, and encouraged the archbishops to carry through his plan of reform, as long as these touched only points of doctrine. But when Butzer began to preach in Cologne (1542), and the archbishop seemed inclined to undertake a re-organization of the hierarchical system, Gropper denounced them to the Pope and the emperor; and when Hermann von Wied was deposed, and Adolf von Schaumburg put in his place, Gropper became a decided opponent to ecclesiastical reform in any shape. His principal work is Institution catholica, 1550.
severe, not only condemning the unclerical amusements and immoral lives of the monks, but en-
deavoring to do away with the evils of “farming” by endowing parishes, that they might secure pastors who would care for the souls of the people. To this end he used the revenues of the monasteries. Grosseteste, however, was not a foe to religious orders, but only to their abuses. He sought zealously to raise the standard, and in-
crease the efficiency, of the ministry, by refusing to appoint to livings those whose youth, world-
liness, or illiteracy made them unfit, and by removing corrupt and incompetent incumbents. Within a short time after his consecration, he deposed seven abbots and four priors. This vigorous administration aroused opposition. The bishop’s life was even attempted by poison. Some of the monasteries endeavored to evade his visita-
tion; but he was equal to such emergencies, and, as in the case of Hertford, placed the whole town under interdict. As a result of refusing to install Frederick de Lavenaga into a stall at Lincoln, to which the Pope, his uncle, had appointed him. In a very plain letter the bishop tells the pontiff that it is his duty to make appoint-
ments for the edification, and not for the destruc-
tion, of the Church. Matthew Paris reports that the Pope was in high dudgeon on receiving this letter, and was only pacified by the cardinals, who reminded him of the fearless courage, the power, and popularity of the English prelate.

Like Luther, previous to the diet of Worms, so Grosseteste had trusted in the Pope, and hoped for relief from Rome against the ecclesiastical corruption of England. Once undeceived, he was drifting rapidly away from all veneration for the papal court, when death overtook him. In a conver-
sation on his death-bed with the scholarly cleric and physician, John de St. Giles, he gave a de-
nition of heresy, and asked whether the Pope did not fulfill it. To those around him he lamented the doleful condition of the Church. He died uttering protests against the avarice, simony, lust, and worldliness of the papal court. “He was the open rebuker of both the Pope and the king, censor of prelates, corrector of monks, instructor of clerks, an unwearied examiner of the books of Scrip-
ture, a crusher and disserter of the Romans,” so says the chronicler Matthew Paris. He was buried in great pomp at Lincoln; the Archbishop of Canterbury and several bishops being present at the funeral. This seems to disprove the state-
ment that the Pope had excommunicated him. Miracles were reported to be performed at his grave; but in vain did prelates and King Edward I. (1307) apply for Grosseteste’s canonization. The popular veneration was shown in the legend that the bishop appeared to the Pope on the night of his death, with the words, “Aryse, wretch, and come to thy doom.” Grosseteste has been called a “harbinger of the Reformation.” He certainly was a zealous reformer of ecclesiastical abuses in the diocese of Lincoln, and boldly protested against the corrup-
tions of the papal court. In his large acquaint-
ance with and constant appeal to the Scriptures he was in advance of his age. He was the first link in the chain of the Reformation in this sense, that Wiclif appealed to him, and quotes his pro-
test against Rome, as, later, Luther quoted Hus, and Hus learned from Wiclif. In his impetuous
GROTIUS.

916 GROVES.

and fearless temper he resembles Luther. Not only Wiclif, but others, like Bishop Hall, delighted to find in the Bishop of Lincoln a support for their scriptural views, or, like Field, to use his name against the claims of the Pope to authority in the Church (Of the Church, vol. iv. pp. 384 sqq.).


D. S. SCHAFER.

GROTIUS, Hugo (Hulig von Groot), a celebrated Dutch statesman, lawyer, and theologian; was b. at Delft, April 10, 1583; and d. at Rostock, Aug. 29, 1645. His career was intimately associated, and largely sympathized, with the fortunes of the Arminians. His contributions to exegetical and apologetic literature, to systematic theology and canon law, also give him an important place in the history of theological thought.

His family was of noble extraction; his father a burgomaster of Holland; his mother a member of the Van Lennep family, who was one of his professors. John of Barneveld early recognized his talents, and took him on a mission to France. Grotius devoted himself specially to the study of the law, but his tastes ran rather in the direction of literature. His earliest works, besides several editions of Latin authors, were three dramas (Christ Suffering, the Story of Joseph, and Adam Exiled), and a historical work on the Batavian republic (De Antiquitate Rep., Basel, 1610). But he soon became involved in the theological controversies which agitated Holland at that time. He espoused the cause of the Arminians. After the victory of the Gomarists (Calvinists), at the synod of Dort, he was condemned (1619) to perpetual imprisonment at Lowestead. During this imprisonment he composed several of his works. An ingenious artifact of his wife effected his escape. He concealed himself in a chest which had been frequently used to carry books and clothing to and from his cell. He was taken thus to the house of a friend, and escaped in the disguise of a mason to France. Louis XIII. granted him a pension of three thousand livres, and De Thou and others treated him kindly. The dislike of Richelieu obliged him to quit France, but the favor of Christina gave him a distinguished reception in Sweden. She sent him as ambassador to France, where he remained for ten years. He was recalled at his own request, at the end of the remaining years in his native land.

The vessel that bore him was driven out of its course by a storm. He became sick, got as far as Rostock on his journey, and there died, repeating the prayer, "God be merciful to me a sinner." His body lies buried at Delft. — This is not the proper place to speak of the eminent services of Grotius as an expounder of the laws of nature and nations. He concerns us only as a theologian. His great exegetical work (Annotations upon the Old and New Testament) was for a considerable time unused, except by the Arminians. It became popular, however, on account of the authority of his name from dogmatic presuppositions and his effort to get at the plain philological and historical sense. His apologetical work (De Veritate Rel. Christianae) was projected in prison, but first published 1627. It was designed for seamen who came in contact with Mohammedans and heathens. It has been very popular down to a recent date, and was translated into French, English (Patrick; also by Clarke, reprinted, London, 1860), Chinese, Malay, Arabic (Poocke), and many other languages, as the best thing in its line. Grotius was an Arminian, but disclaimed Pela- gianism, and, in his Defense of the Catholic Faith concerning the Satisfaction of Christ against Socinians (1617), denied any leanings toward Socinianism. Departing from the strict Anselmic theory, he substituted, in place of a real satisfaction on the part of Christ, a divine acquittal for Christ's sake. In Christ's death, which satisfied God's majesty, and exhibited his detestation of sin, he saw a terrible example of punishment designed to deter men from sin.


HAGENBACH.

GROVES and TREES, Sacred. In the Hebrew Old Testament there is no mention of sacred groves, for the word so translated in the authorized version means properly an image to Asherah (see ASHERAH); but sacred trees are repeatedly observable in the later Israelitish history. Joshua set up a memorial-stone under the oak at Shechem (Josh. xxiv. 28). The angel of the Lord appeared to Gideon under the oak at Ophrah (Judg. vi. 11), who built an altar there. Saul, under an oak at Gibeah (1 Sam. vii. 17), established an altar, and Deborah under a palm-tree (Judg. iv. 5), held court. The inhabitants of Jabesh-Gilead buried the ashes of Saul and his sons under the tamarisk-tree at Jabesh (1 Sam. xxxi. 13). Worship under
of them present with a peculiarly stirring life. His religious genius, was not altogether without many followers, and witnesses. His peculiar doctrines of baptism as the true foundation of the Church, of the Apostles' Creed as the true conditions of salvation, of the "living word" as the true vehicle of the Holy Spirit, he set forth in the most uncompromising opposition to what rationalism had to say about the axioms of reason, philosophical criticism, and grammatico-historical exegesis. The controversy occasioned a civil suit; and Grundtvig was sentenced to pay a fine, and to publish nothing without permission of the royal censor. He was finally suspended; but from that day there was in the Danish Church a party called "Grundtvigians," and a platform called "Grundtvigianism."

From 1820 to 1839 Grundtvig lived in literary retirement in Copenhagen. He visited England, and gave by his words and writings a powerful impulse to the Anglo-Saxon study there; edited a theological monthly, in which his ideas found their proper exposition and suitable application; published True Christianity, his principal theological work, and an ornament to modern apologetics; the Sunday-Book, a collection of sermons which has found a larger circulation in Scandinavia than any other book of the kind; the Hymn-Book, a collection of hymns, partly original, partly translated, which gave to song in the Danish churches a new and very original character. Meanwhile his influence spread far beyond the capital, throughout the whole kingdom, and even to the neighboring countries, especially Norway, everywhere causing a spiritual revival, in which religion and patriotism, Christianity and nationality, are most happily blended together. In 1839 he was made pastor of the Varton in Copenhagen; and there he remained till his death, the head of a strong and well-organized party, which, especially in 1848, made itself felt in the church, in the school, and in politics, always bringing life and progress and reform with it. See Denmark. In 1853 he was made a bishop. He was three times married, and over seventy years old when he baptized his youngest son.

LIT. — PAUL FY: N. F. S. Grundtvig, Copenhagen, 1871; J. KAFFEMAN: Grundtvig, der Prophet des Nordens, Basel, 1876. CLEMENS PETERSEN.

CRYSNUS is the name of a Susian family which settled at Basel, and during two centuries produced several celebrated theologians there. — Simon Crysnus, b. at Vehringen, 1493; d. at Basel, Aug. 1, 1541; was educated in the school of Pförzheim; studied theology, first in Vienna, afterwards at Wittenberg; was professor of Greek at Heidelberg (1524-29), and was called to Basel when Erasmus left that city on account of the introduction there of the Reformation. In 1531 he was made professor of theology; in 1534 he established the Reformation in Württemberg; in 1540 he partook in the disputation of Worms. His letters and a list of his works were published by W. Th. Streuber, Basel, 1847. — Johann Jacob Crysnus, b. at Bern, Oct. 1, 1540; d. at Basel, Aug. 13, 1517; studied at Basel and Tubingen, and was appointed preacher at Rödelem 1556, professor of the Old Testament at Basel 1575, at Heidelberg 1584, and professor of the New Testament at Basel 1586. Some of his letters were published by Scultetus 1612, others by Paulus 1672. A life of him, partly an autobiography, and containing a list of his numerous writings, appeared at Basel 1618.

QUALBERT, Giovanni, founded in the middle of the eleventh century the Cenobite order of Vallombrosa (calice umbrosae), in the Apennines,
near Florence, in the diocese of Fiesole. He was the first to introduce lay-brethren (fratres conversi) in the monasteries, in order that the religious brethren (properly speaking, the patres) might be able to devote themselves entirely to contemplation and prayer. He died 1093, and was canonized by Celestine III. 1193. His life is found in Act. Sanct. O. B., II.

GUIDULE, St., popularly called Goulou or Er goule, was a daughter of Duke Thierry of Lorraine and St. Amalberge; devoted her life to the severest ascetic practices; d. Jan. 8, 712, and was soon after canonized on account of the miracles wrought at her tomb. She is the patroness of Brussels; and the cathedral of that city is dedicated to her. See Act. Sanct., Jan. 8.

QUELLE and GHIBELLINE are the Italianized forms of the German Welf (the ducal house of Saxony) and Waiblingen (the native castle of the Hohenstaufenfs). The German names were first used, it is said, as battle-cries at Wimsberge (1140), and then became party designations,—on the one side, the princes with their aspirations of independence; on the other, the emperor with his demands of authority. Transferred to Italy, the names were applied to the adherents of the emperor (the Ghibellines) and the adherents of the Pope (the Guelfs): though many other and very different elements might be introduced into the platform; as, for instance, when two city-republics, Pisa and Genoa, Ferrara and Mantua, etc., vied with each other, and immediately became Guelf and Ghibelline; or even when the rivalry existed only between two families, as the Montecchi and Capulet(i in Verona, the Lam bertazé and Geremci in Bologna, etc.

QUIBERT OF PARMA was by the Empress Agnes made chancellor of the kingdom of Italy, and was thus by the very nature of his office placed in opposition to Hildebrand. It was due to him that Nicholas II., in his famous decree concerning papal elections, admitted the influence of the king of Germany; and when Alexander II. was elected Pope, without the consent of Henry IV. or his mother, the Empress Agnes, Gui bert caused Bishop Cadalus of Parma to be elected antipope, under the name of Honorius II. The measure proved a complete failure; but, by the exertions of Agnes, Guibert was reconciled to Hildebrand, and in 1073 he was made Archbishop of Ravenna. His opposition, however, to Hildebrand's policy, was not merely the result of his office as chancellor. He hated that manner in which Gregory VII. used the monks, the Fatari, and the mass of the people, to enforce his authority over the clergy; and, as Archbishop of Ravenna, he resisted this policy in every way possible. In 1075 he was suspended, but he did not yield. In the contest between Henry IV. and Gregory VII. he sided with the former; and in 1080 he was elected antipope at Brixen by thirty bishops, and assumed the name of Clement III. In 1084 he crowned Henry Emperor in Rome. But, though Henry never abandoned him, he was never able to vindicate himself against the fury of the Hildebrand party. Not only Gregory VII., but also Victor III., Urban II., and Paschalis II., cursed and excommunicated him. He died at Ravenna, 1100; and, after the death of Henry IV., Paschalis II. ordered his bones to be dug up, and thrown into the water. See JAFFE: Regest. Pontif. Rom., pp. 443-447.

QUERICKE, Heinrich Ernst Ferdinand, b. at Wettin, Feb. 25, 1803; d. at Halle, Feb. 4, 1878; studied theology at Halle; was appointed professor there 1829, and wrote a biography of Francke 1827, a handbook of church history 1833 (8th ed. 1856; translated into English by W. G. T. Shedd, New York, 1857-63, 2 vols.), an Alg. chrisl. Symbolik 1839, etc. He was a very strict Lutheran, and opposed the exactions of the Prussian Government to effect a union between the Lutheran and Reformed churches, and founded, together with Rudebach, the Zeitschrift f. luth. Theol. in 1840.

QUIBERT OF NOGENT, b. at Clermont, 1053; d. at Nogent, 1124; entered in 1064 the Benedictine monastery of Floy or St. Germer, where he came under the influence of Anselm, at that time prior of Bec, and a frequent visitor in Floy, and was in 1104 made abbot of Nogent-sous-Coucy, in the diocese of Laon. He was a man of great learning, and exercised considerable influence on the circle to which he belonged; but he knew it too well himself, and the impression which his writings make is not always so very agreeable, on account of his vanity and pride. His works were edited by D'Achery (Paris, 1651), and reprinted in Migne (Patrol. Lat. 156 and 184). The most interesting of his works are: 1. De pignoribus sanctorum, occasioned by the exhibition, in the monastery of St. Medard, near Soissons, of one of Christ's teeth, and criticism; the most frankness the worship of saints and relics which was the rage of the time; 2. Historia Hierosolymitana, a history of the first crusade, written about 1108, and a rich source of knowledge; 3. De vita sua sive Monadiorum Libri III., of which the first book contains an autobiography in imitation of Augustine's Confessions, the second the history of the monastery of Nogent, and the third the history of the diocese of Laon. The two last works have been translated into French, in GYZOT: Coll. de Memoires, Paris, 1825.

QUIBERT OF NOGENT was by the Empress Agnes made chancellor of the kingdom of Italy, and was thus by the very nature of his office placed in opposition to Hildebrand. It was due to him that Nicholas II., in his famous decree concerning papal elections, admitted the influence of the king of Germany; and when Alexander II. was elected Pope, without the consent of Henry IV. or his mother, the Empress Agnes, Guibert caused Bishop Cadalus of Parma to be elected antipope, under the name of Honorius II. The measure proved a complete failure; but, by the exertions of Agnes, Guibert was reconciled to Hildebrand, and in 1073 he was made Archbishop of Ravenna. His opposition, however, to Hildebrand's policy, was not merely the result of his office as chancellor. He hated that manner in which Gregory VII. used the monks, the Fatari, and the mass of the people, to enforce his authority over the clergy; and, as Archbishop of Ravenna, he resisted this policy in every way possible. In 1075 he was suspended, but he did not yield. In the contest between Henry IV. and Gregory VII. he sided with the former; and in 1080 he was elected antipope at Brixen by thirty bishops, and assumed the name of Clement III. In 1084 he crowned Henry Emperor in Rome. But, though Henry never abandoned him, he was never able to vindicate himself against the fury of the Hildebrand party. Not only Gregory VII., but also Victor III., Urban II., and Paschalis II., cursed and excommunicated him. He died at Ravenna, 1100; and, after the death of Henry IV., Paschalis II. ordered his bones to be dug up, and thrown into the water. See JAFFE: Regest. Pontif. Rom., pp. 443-447.

ALBRECHT VOGEL.

GUIDO OF AREZZO, monk in the monastery of Pomposa, in the diocese of Ferrara; distinguished himself as a musician and composer, and made a number of improvements in the method which he saw introduced, not only in Italy, but also in France and Germany. His activity falls between 1024 and 1037, but the dates of his birth and death are unknown. His inventions he has described in his Micrologus de Disciplina Artis Musicæ, and Argumentum nostri Cantus.
GUIDO DE BRES, b. at Mons, 1528; d. at Valenciennes, 1567; was educated in the Roman Church, but converted by the reading of the Scriptures. Expelled from his native city, he went to London, where Walloon preachers had been in the reign of Edward VI., and where he prepared himself for the office of a preacher. In 1563 he returned to Flanders, labored there as an itinerant preacher, and founded the first evangelical congregation at Lille. A second congregation was dispersed by armed force, and Guido was again compelled to flee. He repaired to Geneva, became an ardent disciple of Calvin, returned once more to Flanders, formed congregations at Tour- nay, Lille, and Valenciennes, wrote the Belgic Confession (which article see), but was taken prisoner at the capture of Valenciennes, in 1567, and hanged. His life and some of his letters are found in Histoire des Martys, Geneva, 1617.

GUILBERT OF SEMPRINGHAM. See Gilbert of Sempringham.

GUIDLS, voluntary associations for the promotion of religious or moral objects within the pale of the Church of England and the Episcopal Church of the United States, are of recent origin. The prototypes of the modern institution were the guilds of the middle ages, the last vestiges of which in England were swept away by the Reformation. These were merchant, craft, and religious guilds; and their object was to advance the temporal and eternal welfare of their members by mutual protection, support, and prayer. After a long interval, the name was revived, and given to a new organization in 1851,—the Guild of St. Alban of Manchester. The ends this league proposed to itself were wholly religious, and the membership composed of communicants in the Church of England. Previously, in 1844, the Brotherhood of the Holy Trinity was organized at Oxford, which is sometimes, but wrongly, represented as the first guild. In 1861 two other guilds were organized—the Brotherhood of Love of Jesus, Plymouth, and the Sisterhood of St. Peter, Kilburn. Since that time, the idea and the name have become very popular; and the number of organizations has largely increased, not only in England and her colonies, but also in the Episcopal Church of the United States. In 1873 a union of the guilds of Great Britain was effected under the title of the Church Guilds' Union, which holds an annual meeting.

The primary object of the guilds is to carry on more effectually parish-work, by inducing each communicant to exercise his own natural talents, and by pointing out the work proper for each to do. The spiritual objects vary, and are such as the visitation of the sick, inducing persons to be confirmed, caring for the poor, providing healthy amusements, etc. They are essentially lay societies, and designed to " impart dignity to the la- yan's work now wanting to it." They assist the parish in its support, and by their gifts would go so far as to exclude the parish clergyman from the offices of the society. The guilds may direct their energies to the general interests of the parish. But they are also organized for special objects; as the medical Guild of St. Luke, the missionary Guild of St. Savior, the Church and Stage Guild, A Soul's Guild for the reform of burial, etc. For a good account of the history and objects of guilds, see Guild Papers, contributed by Officers of Various Church Guilds, London.

GUILLON, Marie Nicolas Sylvestre, b. in Paris, Jan. 1, 1768; d. at Meudon, Oct. 16, 1832; was almoner and librarian to the Princess Lamballe, but fled from Paris, after her execution in 1792, and lived for several years in the provinces under an assumed name (Pastel), practising medicine. Having returned to Paris in 1798, he served Napoleon, the Bourbons, and the Orleanists successively, and with equal ease; accompanied Cardinal Fesch to Rome, and was made professor of rhetoric in the Lycée Bonaparte; was almoner to the Princess of Orleans; and became canon of St. Denis, Bishop of Morocco (in partibus infidelium), Dean of the Sorbonne, etc. He was a very pro- life writer, and some of his works (Collection des brevres du Pope Pie VI., Paris, 1792; Bibliotheque choisie des Pères grecs el latins, Paris, 1822, 26 vols.; a translation of Cyprian with notes, Paris, 1837, 2 vols., etc.) are valuable.

GUIDE, The House of, formed a younger branch of the house of Lorraine, and was founded in the beginning of the sixteenth century by Claude, the second son of René II. In 1508 he received all the French possessions of the family,—Guise, Etoile, Aumale, Mayenne, Joinville, etc.,—the archbishops of Rheims, the bishopric of Metz, etc., which were family benefices; and in 1537 he was made Duke of Guise, and governor of Champagne and Bourgogne. He died in 1550; but in the next two generations his sons (Duke Francis of Guise, and Cardinal Charles of Lorraine) and his grandsons (Duke Henry of Guise, and Cardinal Louis of Lorraine) played the most prominent part in the history of France as leaders of the Roman-Catholic party, heads of the League, supporters of the Jesuit movement, and cruel suppressors of the Huguenots.

Duke Francis of Guise, b. Feb. 17, 1519; d. Feb. 24, 1568; was a valiant soldier. In 1552 he stopped Charles V. at Metz, and in 1566 he took Calais from the English. When Francis II., who had married his niece, Mary, Queen of Scots, ascended the French throne in 1559, the whole military command of the realm was intrusted to him, just as the whole civil administration was put into the hands of his brother, Cardinal Charles of Lorraine.—Charles, b. Feb. 17, 1524; d. Dec. 26, 1574; was made Archbishop of Rheims when he was fourteen years old, and cardinal when he was twenty-three. He held ten bishoprics, besides a great number of abbeys, and had an annual income of three hundred thousand crowns at a time when the total revenue of France was not more than five or six millions. He was supercilious and depraved, but cunning and eloquent. He began life as a pupil of the Renaissance and a friend of ecclesiastical reform; but, after his meeting with Cardinal Granvelle, he became a partisan of Philip II., and a champion of the Roman Church. A sudden turn took place in his fortunes and in those of his family by the unexpected death of Francis II. in 1560. He retired to Rheims, Francis to Guise; and the royal princes, the Bourbons, Condés, etc., returned to power. On the basis, however, of the defence of Romanism against Protestantism, Francis succeeded in forming an alliance at the court, and
he was on his way to Paris when the massacre at Vassy occurred (1562);—the slaughter of a whole Protestant congregation, assembled at worship, liptly political. The Huguenot arms, and the civil war began. Francis was placed at the head of the Roman-Catholic army, defeated the Huguenots at Dreux, and besieged their stronghold, Orleans, where he was shot dead by Poitrot de Mercé. At the re-opening of the Council of Trent in 1562, the cardinal wanted to gather the whole opposition around himself, but he utterly failed; and he afterwards became very zealous for the introduction in France of the canons of the council. On his return, he was very coldly received by the court; but the particular friendship which Philip II. showed him, the brilliant military successes of his nephew, Duke Henry of Guise, and the lavish support he gave to literature and art, continued to give him a certain influence. He left a considerable debt when he died.

Duke Henry of Guise, b. Dec. 31, 1550; d. Dec. 29, 1558; a son of Duke Francis; inherited his father's valor and military ability, but exceeded him far in political ambition, and hatred to the Huguenots. If not the founder, he was at all events the head of the League from its very beginning in 1576. He formed the closest alliances with Philip II. (who gave him an annual pension of two hundred thousand francs) and with the Pope, who, at his instance, excommunicated Henry of Navarre. After the death of the Duke of Anjou, in 1554, he actually aspired to the throne of France; and both the Pope and Philip II. considered it necessary to support him, if France should not become Calvinistic. But he seems to have lacked courage. He procrastinated; and when the king, Henry III., thoroughly understood the drift of affairs, he had him assassinated at Blois by his guardsman, him and his brother, Cardinal Louis of Lorraine.—Louis, b. July 6, 1555; d. Dec. 23, 1558; was a wit, and played only a secondary rôle.

Lit. — Duke Francis left a kind of diary, which is found in Michaud et Ponjaulot: Nouvelle Collection de Mén provant, Paris, 1839. The best account of the destinies of this famous family is Récit de Boulliot, Histoire des Ducs de Guise, Paris, 1835, 4 vols.

GUNPOWDER PLOT, a conspiracy (1604—05) of some Roman Catholics for blowing up Parliament House while Parliament was in session, and killing the king, and thus securing advantages for their Church. The Roman Catholics, who had been held down under Elizabeth, expected concessions from James I., but were disappointed. Robert Catesby and Guy Fawkes were the leading conspirators. A building was rented next to Parliament House in 1604, and work begun in boring through the walls, which were nine feet thick, when an opportunity was afforded them of renting the cellar of the Parliament House itself. The conspirators deposited thirty-six kegs of powder there, covering them with stones and fa ots. The plot was to be very high pitch under the bishop's speech, the accused deemed it most advisable to submit to every thing: so they did; and the acts of this towering stupidity are still extant (D'Achery, Spir., I.; Mans, Concil. XIX.). But outside of those acts nothing is known either of Gundulphe, or his doctrines, or his followers.

GUNPOWDER PLOT. 920
to death Jan. 31, 1806. The day previous four
had suffered for the same crime.

The 5th of November was ordered to be kept as
The principles of this society were very disastrous
to the cause of the Roman Catholics in England.
The 5th of November was ordered to be kept as
a national holiday by an act which was not re-
pelled for two hundred years. One of the popu-
lar festivities of the day has been to dress up a
figure in rags, parade the streets, singing rhymes,
and for light burning it. See the Histories of
England.

GÜNTHER, Anton, b. at Lindenau, in Boho-
missia, Nov. 17, 1783; d. at Vienna, Feb. 24, 1803;
studied first law, then theology; was ordained
priest in 1820, and lived mostly in Vienna, as
teacher of philosophy. His works, of which the
principal are Forschule zur speculativen Theologie
(1828), Süd- und Nord-lichter (1832), Thomas a
Scrupulis (1835), Die Juste-Milieu (1837), do not
present a finished philosophical system, but are
only an attack on the reigning monism, and an at-
temt at reconciling the Roman-Catholic dogma
and modern science. They attracted much atten-
tion, however, and found, like those of Hermes,
many ardent students; but in 1857 they were put
on the Index. See P. KnoD: Anton Günther,
Wien, 1881, 2 vols.; J. FLEGG: A. Günthers Dua-

Gurnall, William, author of a quaint and
b. at Lynn, 1616; d. at Lavenham, October, 1679.
He graduated at Cambridge; in 1644 became rec-
tor of Lavenham, and at the Restoration signed
the Act of Uniformity. The Christian in Com-
plete Armour, or a Treatise on the Saints' War with
the Devil, etc., is a series of sermons on Eph. vi.
6-20, abounding in epigrammatic sayings, and
displaying great skill in applying Scripture. It
was published in three volumes in 1655, sixth
dition, 1679, and many times since; new edition,
London, 1886, in two volumes, with Introduction
by R. Fry.

Gurney, Joseph John, an eminent philantropi-
ist, and minister of the Society of Friends; b. at
Earlham Hall, near Norwich, Aug. 2, 1788; d.
Jan. 4, 1847. He attended lectures for a while
at Oxford, and was recognized in 1818 as a minis-
ter by the Friends. The three years between
1837 and 1840 he spent in the United States and
the West Indies, preaching. He was a man of
rare piety and simplicity of character, and always
foremost in enterprises of benevolence and hu-
mantity, using his large wealth with a liberal
hand. He aided his sister, Mrs. Fry, in her mea-
ures for prison-reform, and was the associate with
Mr. Gurney issued quite a number of tracts
and pamphlets, with some larger works. Of these
the principal are, Essays on the Evidences, Doc-
trines, and Practical Operations of Christianity,
Lond., 1827, trans. into Spanish and German;
History, Authority, and Use of the Sabbath, Lond.,
1831; Pasterm devoted to its Root, 1845. These
works passed through a number of editions. See
Memoirs of J. J. Gurney, by Braithwaite (Nor-
wich and Phila., 1854, 2 vols., 3d ed., 1855) and
Hodgson (Phil., 1855).

Qury, Jean Pierre, b. at Maileronecourt, Jan.
23, 1801; d. at Mercure, France, April 18, 1869;
became a Jesuit, 1824; taught moral theology in
Jesuit Colleges; and wrote Compendium theologia
morals (1850) and Casus Conscientiae (1863), which,
as specimens of the morals taught by the Jesuits,
procured for their author an unenviable notoriety.
See LINN: Das Handbuch Gurys und die christliche
Ethik, Freiberg, 1869; and Vie (anon.), Paris, 1867.

Gustavus Adolphus. See Thirty-Year's
War.

Gustavus-Adolphus-Association. The
idea of this association was first conceived by Dr.
Grossmann of Leipzig in 1829, when the second
centennial of the death of the great Protestant
hero was celebrated at Lützen, Nov. 6. Not sim-
ply a monument of brass or stone should be raised
in his honor, but a monument of living men, doing
the same work as he had done,— aiding and
supporting Protestant families and congregations
whenever aid and support were needed. An asso-
ciation was formed; and Oct. 4, 1834, its statutes
were confirmed by the Saxon king. In the be-
inning the success was very slender. Though
10,000 thalers were sent from Sweden, the total
capital of the association in 1841 was only 12,850
thalers. But in the same year Legrand, pastor
of Basel, and Karl Zimmermann, court-preacher
at Darmstadt, made most effective appeals to the
public, setting forth the religious privations, chi-
caneries, and dangers to which evangelical fami-
lies and congregations are exposed when living in
the midst of a Roman-Catholic population. Branch
societies were formed in various places in
Germany, as also in foreign countries, and were
brought in connection with the mother associa-
tion; and at the general assembly in Stuttgart,
1845, the accounts of the association showed an
income of 42,000 thalers for the last year. Aid
had been given to 62 congregations. In several
countries, as, for instance, in Bavaria, the asso-
ciation met with strong opposition from the
Roman-Catholic government; and during the rev-
olutionary years of 1848 and 1849 the interest
slackened,— the revenue sank down to 21,000
thalers. But in 1850 matters began to improve, and
since that time progress has been made every
year. The association, comprising 45 minor asso-
ciations, with 1,160 branch societies, 8 students'
and 371 women's associations, owns now a capital
of 336,401 marks. Since its foundation it has
distributed 14,783,798 marks, and has built 1,068
churches, 639 schoolhouses, 42 cemeteries, and
358 parsonages. See K. ZIEMER: Geschichte des
Gustav Adolf Vereins, Darmstadt, 1877; W.
PRESSL: Bauweise zur Geschichte d. G. A. Ve-
eine, 1878, 2 vols., and Der G. A. Vereins und das
Volk Israel, Tübing., 1879. K. ZIEMER.

Guthlac, St., presbyter, and hermit of Crow-
land; b. 674; d. 714. The child of nobles, he
showed martial rowess, and attacked, at
seven years of age, the monastery where he had
repaired to a monastery, and then, full of enthu-
siasm for a solitary life, crossed over to Crowland,
a desolate island off the extreme south coast of
Lincolnshire, and there lived as a hermit. But his fame for piety attracted many admirers, and the hermit became a teacher of righteousness, while "men of divers conditions, nobles, bishops, abbots, poor, rich, from Mercia, and all Britain," made up his congregation. He was ordained a priest by Hedda, Bishop of Liechfeld. At first in his sermons he was passionate and tormented by visions; but he resisted vigorously, and found in the cultivation of the soil, and in the giving of spiritual counsel, abundant distraction. One day he made this beautiful remark to a visitor, "Who hath led his life after God's will, the wild beasts and wild birds will become more intimate with him, and the man who will pass his life apart from worldly men, to him the angels approach nearer." On the site of his cell and oratory Ethelbald erected a monastery. See article in Smith and Wace, Dict. Chr. Biog., vol. ii. pp. 823—826.

GUTHRIE, Thomas, D.D., Scottish preacher and editor; son of David Guthrie; b. at Brechin, July 12, 1803; d. at St. Leonard's-on-the-Sea, Feb. 23, 1873. He was educated first at the schools of his native place, then at the University of Edinburgh, where he attended from 1815 to 1829; studied medicine in Paris in 1827; and conducted a bank agency in Brechin from 1828 to 1830. He was licensed to preach in 1825; ordained minister of the parish of Arbirlot on May 13, 1830; translated to collegiate charge of old Greyfriars Church, Edinburgh, Sept. 10, 1837; and appointed minister of the new parish of St. John's, in the same city, Nov. 19, 1840. At the disruption he joined the Free Church, and became minister of the Church of Free St. John's, which charge he held until disabled by illness in 1864, when he became pastor emeritus. After this he became editor of the Sunday Magazine, in the pages of which most of his later works appeared. He obtained the degree of D.D. from the University of Edinburgh in 1849; and was moderator of the Free Church of Scotland in 1862.

He was greatly distinguished as a preacher, though his peculiarities were not those which have usually been associated with the Scotch pulpit. He discovered the members of his Bible-class at Arbirlot, how much an illustration did to assist the understanding and memories of his hearers, he cultivated the pictorial and illustrative in his discourses; and by the charm of his figures, the simplicity of his style, and the dramatic power of his manner, he rose to the front rank of pulpit orators. He wrote his sermons, and committed them to memory so fully, that he could give with ease that which he had prepared with elaboration. His delivery was at first slow and measured; and, though he waxed warmer as he proceeded, he never lost his self-possession. He had nothing of the whirlwind of Chalmers, and rarely became impassioned; but he was always dramatic. Occasionally the drapery of his illustration rather overlaid the truth which he desired to illustrate; but generally "the story, like the feathers of an arrow, made its way, and left the mark in its track." Guthrie was eminent also as a philanthropist. His pastorate of St. John's took him down into the dens of the Edinburgh Cowgate, and stirred him up to do his utmost for the elevation of the depraved. Thus began his labors for Ragged Schools, with which his name will be always associated; for, though Sheriff Watson of Aberdeen was in that field before him, it was Guthrie's plea that first roused public attention to the need for such institutions. He was also prominent in the temperance cause, and for years was one of the foremost advocates of total abstinence. In the same line he took up Chalmers's territorial system, and was instrumental in rearing, on that principle, several churches in Edinburgh, which are now prosperous and self-supporting.

He was the means of raising a large sum of money for the erection of parsonages for the ministers of the Free Church; and every cause which had for its object the righting of wrong, or the alleviation of distress, or the restoration of the fallen, found in him a noble advocate.

His editorial labors, while sustaining fully, did not increase, his reputation; but they furnished him with an opportunity of showing, that, while he was steadfastly attached to his own religious belief, he could stretch a brother's hand to all classes of Christians; and so, when he died, there was no man more generally lamented by men of every denomination.

Lit. — Autobiography and Memoirs of Thomas Guthrie, D.D., by his sons David K. and Charles Guthrie, 1873; Plea for Ragged Schools, 1847; Second Plea for Ragged Schools, 1849; Seed-time and Harvest of Ragged Schools, 1860; The Gospel in Ezekiel (sermons), 1855; The City, its Sins and Sorrows, 1857; Christ and the Inheritance of the Saints, 1858; The Way to Life, 1862; Speaking to the Heart, 1862; Man and the Gospel, 1865; The Angel's Song, 1865; The Parables, 1866; Our Father's Business, 1867; Out of Harness, 1867; Early Piety, 1868; Studies of Character from the O. T., 1868, 1870; Sundays Abroad, 1871. Works, reprinted N.Y., 1873—76, 11 vols., and his Autobiography and Life in 2 vols. WM. M. TAYLOR.

GUTZLAFF, Karl Friedrich August, b. at Stettin, 1802; d. at Victoria, Aug. 9, 1851; went in 1823 to Singapore as a missionary in the service of the Netherland Missionary Society, whence in 1826 to Siam, and in 1831 to China, where he remained as his intercourse with the members of his Bible-class at Arbirlot, how much an illustration did to assist the understandings and memories of his hearers, he cultivated the pictorial and illustrative in his discourses; and by the charm of his figures, the simplicity of his style, and the dramatic power of his manner, he rose to the front rank of pulpit orators. He wrote Sketch of Chinese History, London, 1834, 2 vols., China (topography, literature, religion, jurisprudence, etc.), London, 1838, 2 vols., besides several papers on China and East-Indian matters in the journal of the Geographical Society in London.

QUYON, Jeanne Marie Bouvier de la Mothe, a prominent representative of French mysticism; b. of noble and wealthy parents at Montargis, France, April 16, 1648; d. at Blois, June 9, 1717. Her childhood was spent in the Ursuline convent at Montargis; at the age of 16 she became a nun by her own choice. She was of delicate constitution, and already in early childhood showed an inclination towards ascetic mysticism. The works of Francis de Sales and Madame de Chantal exercised a great influence on her mind. When she read that the latter had branded on her bosom the name of Jesus with a hot iron, she stitched a piece of paper bearing the same name, on the flesh of her own bosom, with a needle, and wore it there. Her parents thwarted her in her desire to take
opposition; and, leaving Grenoble, she journeled back to Turin. At this period she observed painful and prolonged ascetic practices, flagellating herself till the blood ran from the wounds, wearing a girdle studded with iron teeth, tearing her skin with thorns, walking with stones in her shoes, and depriving herself of food and sleep. The fashionable society in which her husband mingled she completely renounced.

In 1677 Madame Guyon was left a widow with three children, and, in spite of offers of marriage, remained a widow. A correspondence with Father La Combe, whom she had met in Montpellier, as well as her association with Madame de Maintenon, led her to devote herself to Christian activity in Gex, near Geneva. Thither she started secretly, in 1681, after securing the sympathy of D'Aranthon, Bishop of Geneva, then in Paris. At Gex she entered the institution for converts from Protestantism, and had La Combe for confessor. She, however, was not happy; and when the bishop proposed to her to become mother superior, and endow the institution with her wealth, she fled to the Ursuline convent at Thoune, where La Combe resided. Her life there was a series of visions, revelations, etc. When La Combe followed a call of the Bishop of Vercelli, in Piedmont, Madame Guyon went to Turin to visit the Marquis of Prunai. They took the journey in company,—a circumstance which gave occasion for scandal, as her removal to Thoune had done before. Soon after, La Combe ordered her to go to Paris, and accompanied her as far as Grenoble. While tarrying there, she began her commentary on the Scriptures, and wrote her Moyen court et très facile de faire oraison ("Short and easy method of prayer"), and Le Cantique des Cantiques ("The Song of Solomon"). Her mysticism, however, awakened peculiar views, and became an object of suspicion, and teaching errors, which Madame Guyon recanted, receiving, in return, a certificate from Bossuet of catholic orthodoxy. She continued to hold meetings in Paris for the advancement of the inner life, and was apprehended Dec. 28, 1695, and placed in confinement at Vincennes, and later in the Bastille, from which, by the intercession of Noailles, now Archbishop of Paris, she was removed to Vaugirard. But a letter of La Combe's (who died insane 1699), calling upon her to do penance for their mutual intimacy, falling into the hands of the king, led him to condemn her again to the Bastille. In 1699 Bossuet secured a complete victory over Fénelon by the condemnation of his Maximes des Saintes, which Madame Guyon renounced.

When La Combe was cited by the general of the order of Barnabites to appear at Paris, and thither Madame Guyon accompanied him. The following year, at the instigation of her brother, Pere de la Mothe, the former was charged with improper relations with Madame Guyon, and for being a follower of Michael Molinos, and thrown into the Bastille. Thenceforth, Madame Guyon's religious views were an object of suspicion, and she herself of harsh treatment. In 1688, a meeting was arranged between her and Bossuet, the most influential prelate of France at that time. The same year, in consequence of complaints, and at Madame Guyon's instance, a commission of three, consisting of Bossuet, Bishop Noailles, and Abbé Tronson, was appointed to examine her writings. Thirty articles were drawn from them, teaching errors, which Madame Guyon recanted, receiving, in return, a certificate from Bossuet of catholic orthodoxy. She continued to hold meetings in Paris for the advancement of the inner life, and was apprehended Dec. 28, 1695, and placed in confinement at Vincennes, and later in the Bastille, from which, by the intercession of Noailles, now Archbishop of Paris, she was removed to Vaugirard. But a letter of La Combe's (who died insane 1699), calling upon her to do penance for their mutual intimacy, falling into the hands of the king, led him to condemn her again to the Bastille.

In 1686 La Combe was summoned to the convent at Thoune, where La Combe resided. Soon after, she was released from imprisonment, but directed to live at Dijon, near Grenoble, where she was not happy; and when the bishop proposed to her to become mother superior, and endow the institution with her wealth, she fled to the Ursuline convent at Thoune, where La Combe resided. Her life there was a series of visions, revelations, etc. When La Combe followed a call of the Bishop of Vercelli, in Piedmont, Madame Guyon went to Turin to visit the Marquis of Prunai. They took the journey in company,—a circumstance which gave occasion for scandal, as her removal to Thoune had done before. Soon after, La Combe ordered her to go to Paris, and accompanied her as far as Grenoble. While tarrying there, she began her commentary on the Scriptures, and wrote her Moyen court et très facile de faire oraison ("Short and easy method of prayer"), and Le Cantique des Cantiques ("The Song of Solomon"). Her mysticism, however, awakened peculiar views, and became an object of suspicion, and teaching errors, which Madame Guyon recanted, receiving, in return, a certificate from Bossuet of catholic orthodoxy. She continued to hold meetings in Paris for the advancement of the inner life, and was apprehended Dec. 28, 1695, and placed in confinement at Vincennes, and later in the Bastille, from which, by the intercession of Noailles, now Archbishop of Paris, she was removed to Vaugirard. But a letter of La Combe's (who died insane 1699), calling upon her to do penance for their mutual intimacy, falling into the hands of the king, led him to condemn her again to the Bastille.

In 1688, La Combe was cited by the general of the order of Barnabites to appear at Paris, and thither Madame Guyon accompanied him. The following year, at the instigation of her brother, Pere de la Mothe, the former was charged with improper relations with Madame Guyon, and for being a follower of Michael Molinos, and thrown into the Bastille. Thenceforth, Madame Guyon's religious views were an object of suspicion, and she herself of harsh treatment. In 1688, she was confined to the convent at Faubourg St. Antoine, but subsequently released through the influence of Madame de Maintenon. From 1688 to 1694, she lived mostly at Paris, and often went to Madame de Maintenon's training institute at St. Cyr, where she propagated her peculiar views, and became an object of admiration and reverence. There her first meeting with Fénelon occurred, which led to a cordial friendship. In 1694, a meeting was arranged between her and Bossuet, the most influential prelate of France at that time. The same year, in consequence of complaints, and at Madame Guyon's
GUYSE.

1881. See also BAUSSETT'S Lives of Bossuet and Fénelon.

GUYSE, John, D.D., a dissenting minister; b. at Hertford, Eng., 1680; removed to London, as successor to Matthew Clarke, 1732; lost his sight toward the close of his life; d. Nov. 22, 1761. He is the author of The Practical Expositor, or an Exposition of the New Testament in the Form of a Paraphrase, with Occasional Notes, London, 1739—52, 3 vols., several times reprinted, formerly much esteemed, but now almost forgotten.

GYROVAGI is the name generally given to a kind of vagrant monks which was very numerous when monasticism was first introduced in Western Europe. They had no fixed domicile, but wandered from cell to cell, from hermitage to hermitage, from abbey to abbey, living on the hospitality of their brethren, but giving both to them and to the community at large a very bad example. Augustine and Cassianus wrote against them, and several synods in Gaul tried to suppress them; but they did not disappear until the time of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, when the rules of Benedict became the rules of monasticism in general. Cf. MARTENE: Commentarii in Regulam S. P. Benedicti, Paris, 1690.

ALBRECHT VOGEL.
HAAG ASSOCIATION. 925 HABERKORN.

HAAG (HAQUE) ASSOCIATION, for the Defence of the Christian Religion, The, or The Apological Society of the Hague, was founded in August, 1785, by a number of distinguished Dutch theologians. The occasion was the appearance, in 1782, of Priestley's History of the Corruptions of Christianity; and the object of the society was to take a firm stand against the anti-Christian tendencies of the age. During the first period of its life (1785—1810) its stand-point was strictly orthodox and supranaturalistic. In its publications the accommodation theory of Semler was absolutely rejected; the doctrines of vicarious atonement, the divinity of Christ, the personality of the Holy Spirit, etc., were firmly upheld; and the inspiration of the Scriptures was considered an indisputable fact. During the second period (1810—35) the accommodation theory of Semler was made more prominent, and the stand-point may be characterized as biblico-evangelical. The biblical angelology, the miracles of Elijah and Elisha, were vindicated; the dogmatics and ethics of the Gospel of John were examined; and the biblical idea of revelation was maintained in opposition to the rationalists. The character of the third period (1835—60) was principally determined by the writings of D. F. Strauss and the Tubingen school. The content raged around the very fundamentals of Christianity; and the principles which the society fought for were strongly conservative, though it carried on the fight in a free, scientific spirit. But, from this critico-historical platform, the society, after 1860, gradually glided into the ethico-religious field; and, in spite of the truth and beauty they contain, its publica
tions on slavery, war, capital punishment, woman's rights, and other questions of a similar import, lie far on the periphery of Christian apologetics.

J. J. VAN OOSTERZEK.

HABAKKUK (PiPQl, "embracing"); one of the Minor Prophets of the Old Testament. From the expression (iii. 19), "To the chief singer on my stringed instruments," the inference has with justice been drawn, that he was a Levite; for only Levites and priests could participate in the services of the temple. Nothing further is known of the prophet's life except what has been handed down by unreliable tradition. [The rabbis said he was the son of the Shunammite whom Elisha had restored. A "Habakkuk, son of Joshua, of the tribe of Levi," is reported to have been the author of Bel and the Dragon. He carried food to Daniel in the lions' den, etc.]

Book of. The prophecy of Habakkuk contains (1) the prophet's complaint against the corrupt state of society (i. 2-4); (2) the divine answer, announcing an irruption of the Chaldeans (i. 5—11); (3) the prophet's complaint of the unscrupulous greed and fierceness of the Chaldeans (i. 12—17); (4) the prophet's answer, promising their destruction (ii. 4—20); and (5) the prophet's response to these two divine announcements in a magnificent ode commemorating the majesty of God (iii.). The time of composition is not indicated by any positive statement in the book itself. De Wette, Ewald, and others refer it to the reign of Jehoiakim, and regard the invasion of the Chaldeans alluded to as beginning with the battle of Carchemish (605 B.C.). This view is opposed by ch. i. 5, which represents that invasion as something incredible, and by the fact that Zephaniah (i. 7; comp. Hab. ii. 20) and Jeremiah (iv. 13, v. 6; comp. Hab. i. 8) draw from Habakkuk.

Others place the prophet's activity under Manasseh. The third chapter, which presupposes the restoration of the old temple worship, makes against this view, and for a date after the twelfth year of Josiah's reign (630 B.C.), up to which time idolatry lasted. [This view is strongly presented by Delitzsch in his Commentary.] The sentiments of ch. i. 2-4 are in accord with such a transition period to better things. The style of Habakkuk is classic. Expression and description are artistically rounded off, and less dependent upon older models than the other Minor Prophets. The author deserves a place among the greatest of the prophets; and the lyric poem of ch. iii. surpasses everything of its kind in the Old Testament. It has with justice been said by Umbreit that he resembles Jeremiah in the combination of softness with lofty manliness, and Asaph in his lyric sensitiveness and warmth.

[With reference to the third chapter of Habakkuk, Isaac Taylor says (Hebrew Poetry, American edition, p. 255), "This anthem, unequalled in majesty and splendor of language and imagery, and which, in its closing verses, gives expression in terms the most affecting to an intense feeling, on this ground so fully embodies these religious sentiments as to satisfy Christian piety, even of the loftiest order." Of the same chapter Dean Stanley (Jewish Church, ii. 549) says, "The prophet seems to be transformed into the Psalmist; the ancient poetic fervor of Deborah is rekindled within him." Some of the most frequently quoted passages of Scripture are found in our prophet (i. 13, ii. 14, 15, 20, iii. 2, 18, etc.); and the great truth, "The just shall live by faith" (ii. 4), is used by Paul as the constructive doctrine of two of his Epistles (Rom. i. 17; Gal. iii. 11). Daniel Webster somewhere says that the imagery of Habakkuk is not surpassed in all literature. To be convinced of its grandeur one has only to refer to the description of the invading Chaldeans, whose "horses are swifter than the leopards, and more fierce than the evening wolves" (i. 5—11), and whose greed is as insatiable as death and hell (ii. 5); or to the magnificent description of the power and glory of God (iii. 2—15).


VOLCK.

HABERKORN, Peter, b. at Butzbach, 1804; d. at Giessen, 1676; was first professor at Mar-
burg, then court-preacher at Darmstadt, and finally professor at Glessen. He was one of the lights of Protestant polemics in the seventeenth century, and wrote against Romanism and syncretism: Disputationes ante Walensisburgicas (1688), Enulatio et Americania Grammatica (1853—60), etc., as last memorial, and is said to have done so at the instigation of Protestant polemics in the seventeenth century, and was appointed canon at the church of Nôtre Dame, and became Bishop of Vabres in 1645. He was the first to attack the Jansenists, and is said to have done so at the instigation of Richelieu. His principal writings are, De consen-su hierarchice et monarchice (1640), De primatu Patri (1645), De gratia (1646), etc.

HACKET, John, D.D., Bishop of Lichfield; b. in London, September, 1592; d. at Lichfield, Oct. 21, 1670. He was educated at Cambridge; was chaplain to James I., and made bishop 1661. He was educated at Cambridge; was chaplain to James I., and made bishop 1661. His best known work is the life of Archbishop Williams, under the whimsical title, Scrinia refer-erata, a memorial offer'd to the great deserings of John Williams, D.D., Lord Keeper of the Great Seal of England, and Bishop of York, contain-ing a series of the most remarkable occurrences and transactions of his life in relation both to Church and State, folio, London, 1693; abridged edition, 1715. Darling says this life is "one of the most curious pieces of biography in our language, of great historical value, and full of rare quotations and quaint illustrations."

HACKETT, Horatio Balch, D.D., LL.D., eminent Baptist scholar, and one of the best American exgetes; b. at Salisbury, Mass., Dec. 27, 1808; d. in Rochester, N.Y., Nov. 2, 1875. He was graduated at Amherst College (1830) and Andover Theological Seminary (1833); studied in Germany; was for four years professor of Latin in Brown University; in 1839 became professor of biblical literature in the Newton Theological Institution, and in 1870 professor of New-Testament Greek in Rochester Theological Seminary. As a teacher he was full of enthusiasm and full of learning: he loved his work even in its driest details. In private life he was simple, modest, and humble, warm in his affections, tender in his sympathies, and unaffected in his piety. He was a member of the New-Testament company of the American Bible Revision Committee, as he had previously been of the American Bible Union. His works are very valuable, and include an edition, with notes, of Plutarch's De Sera Numinis Vindicta (1844); a translation, with improvements, of Winer's Chaldee Grammar (1845); an original Hebrew Grammar, with a Chrestomathy (1847); Commentary on the Acts (1851; revised edition, 1858, and again 1877); Illustrations of Scripture, suggested by a Tour through the Holy Land (1855; revised edition, 1868; new edition, 1882); Philemon, new annotated translation (1860); Christian Memorials of the War (1861; transla-tions, with additions, of Van Oosterzee's Commentary on Philemon (1868), and Braune's on Philippians in Lange (1870), for the American edition of Lange; edition of Rawlinson's Historical Illustrations of the Old Testament (1873). In connection with Professor Ezra Abbott he edited the American edition of Smith's Bible Dictionary, New York, 1868-70, 4 vols. See G. H. Whittemore: Memorials of H. B. Hackett, Rochester, 1876.

HA'DAD (דָּד, also דָּדִית), a word of doubtful etymology; was the name of a Syrian divinity. It was also the name of two Edomite kings (Gen. xxxv. 35, xxxvi. 39); "a son of Ishmael (1 Chron. i. 30), and a contemporary of Solomon (1 Kings iv. 33, 14-29), who used of royal blood, fled as a child to Egypt at Joab's defeat of the Edomites. He married the daughter of Pharaoh, and at David's death made an attempt to reconquer his native land. The Hebrew text breaks off so suddenly at verse 22, and verse 25 is so evidently out of place, that we prefer to suppose that the conclusion of his history has, by an error of the copyist, been inserted in the wrong place, and to read at verse 25, with the LXX., "This is the evil that Hadad did, and he abhorred Israel, and reigned over Syria." He is not to be confounded with the HADADEZER (or Hadarezer) of 1 Kings xi. 23. The latter was king of Zobah in the time of David, and exercised considerable power, as is evident from the fact that kings are called his servants (2 Sam. x. 19). See the Bible dictionaries of Winer, Schenkel, Riehm [and Smith].

HA'DAD-RIM'MON, or HA'DAR-RIM'MON (Zech. xii. 11), was either a person over whom the "mourning" was made, a locality at which the event bewailed occurred, or, as Hitzig and others hold, the name of a Syrian divinity, in which case the mourning would be a part of the worship offered to him. The best explanation refers the name to a locality which witnessed the death of Josiah (2 Kings xxiii. 29 sqq.), whose memory was honored by songs of lamentation (2 Chron. xxxv. 23). Although the location has not been identified with certainty, it was probably at the site of the ancient Kummah in the plain of Jezreel, about two miles south of Led-schun (Legio), which is most probably the ancient Megiddo. The name of the town Hadd-Rimmon was, no doubt, originally the name of a deity; Hadd and Rimmon being both the names of gods. See the treatment on Zechariah, the works on Palestine by Reland and Robinson, and the arts. in Winer, Schenkel, Riehm [and Smith].

HADDAN, Arthur West, b. in England, 1816; d. at Barton-on-Heat in England, Feb. 8, 1873. After a distinguished career at the University of Oxford, where he was a fellow of Trinity, he retired (1857) to his quiet country parsonage at Barton-on-Heat, and passed the remainder of his days in pastoral and literary labor. He was a scholar of tireless industry; and besides a thorough monograph upon Apostolic Succession in the Church of England (1869), and numerous articles in Smith's Dictionaries of Christian Biography and of Antiquities, he edited for the Anglo-Catholic Library the works of Archbishop Bramhall (Oxford, 1842-45, 5 vols.), and also those of Herbert Thorndike (Oxford, 1845-55, 5 vols.), and, in connection with Professor Stubbs, the Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland (Oxford, 1869-78). See his Remains, edited by Bishop Forbes, London, 1876.

HA'DES (Greek, ᾠδής, or ᾠηδός, or, in the older Homer, ᾠδή), a privative and of In the unsewn world) is used by Homer as a proper noun for Pluto, the
Hades.

Hades.

god of the unseen or lower world, next brother to Zeus (hence θεός or εἶδος θέος, αἰών, οἰκών, "in" or "into the abode of Hades"). In later writers it signifies a place and state; viz., the unseen spirit-world, or the realm of the departed, the abode of the dead. It occurs in the following passages of the Greek Testament: Matt. xi. 23, xvi. 18; Luke x. 13, xv. 29; Acts ii. 27, 31; Rev. i. 18, vi. 8, xx. 14, 15. In later writers it signifies a place and state; viz., the unseen spirit-world, or the realm of the departed, the abode of the dead. It occurs in the following passages of the Greek Testament: Matt. xi. 23, xvi. 18; Luke x. 13, xv. 29; Acts ii. 27, 31; Rev. i. 18, vi. 8, xx. 14, 15. In later writers it signifies a place distinct from the ave, from the world of the living. It is closely connected with death. The rider on the pale horse in the Apocalypse (vi. 8) is Death; and "Hades follows with him;" and at the judgment, Death and Hades will give up the dead who are in them, and will be cast into the lake of fire (xx. 13, 14.)

1. The ancient Greek view of Hades, and the Roman view of Orcus or Inferna, is that of a place for all the dead in the depth of the earth, dark, dreary, cheerless, and shut up, inaccessible to prayers and sacrifices, ruled over by Pluto. But a distinction was made between Elysium and Tartarus, the temporary abode of the good, and the abode of the wicked.

So Αἰσχυλus, Sophocles, Plato, Plutarch. See Nagelsbach: Homerische Theologie, pp. 405 sqq.; Pfeiffer: Griechische Mythologie, 2d ed., i. 622; and Römische Mythologie, p. 452.

2. The Hebrew Sheol (שֵׁוָל) is the equivalent for the Greek Hades, and is so translated in the Septuagint. It is likewise the subterranean abode of all the dead, but only the temporary abode till the final judgment, and is divided into two departments, called Paradise or Abraham's Bosom, for the good, and Gehenna or Hell, for the bad. In King James's Version, Sheol is variously rendered "hell," "grave," and "pit." In the rabbinical theology, Sheol seems to be nearly identical with Gehinnom, but with two distinct ends,—as a purgatorial fire for the Hebrews, and as a consuming fire for the heathen. See F. WEBER: System der altorientalischen palastinischen Theologie (1880), p. 327; also art. Sheol.

3. In the New Testament, Hades does not differ essentially from the Hebrew Sheol; but Christ has broken the power of death, and dispelled the terrors of Hades, and revealed to believers the idea of heaven as the state and abode of bliss in immediate prospect after a holy life. The English (as also Luther's German) version translates Hades (which occurs ten times in the New Testament) and Gehenna (which occurs twice) by the same word, "hell" (except in 1 Cor. xv. 55, "grave"), and thus obliterates the important distinction between the realm of the dead (or nether-world, spirit-world) and the place of torment or eternal punishment; but in the Revision of 1881 the distinction is restored, and the term Hades introduced. Hades is a temporary jail or prison-house: heaven and hell are permanent and final. But Christ's descent into Hades no doubt created a revolution in that dreary abode. It is very different from what it was under the old dispensation. Christ has "the keys of Death and of Hades" (Rev. i. 18): they have lost their terrors for believers, who pass immediately into the presence of their Lord and Saviour after death (John xiv. 2, 3; Phil. i. 23).

4. In Ecclesiastical Theology the idea of Hades has undergone several modifications. (a) In the ancient church, Hades was the transitory abode of all the departed between death and resurrection, except the martyrs, who pass directly into heaven. So Tertullian, Irenæus, Lactantius, Ambrose. The Gnostics taught a transplantation of the highest order (the pneumatics) into the world of the pleroma.

(b) In the Roman-Catholic Church, Hades has been, since Gregory I., transformed into the purgatory, or the abode of imperfect Christians, till they are pure enough to enter heaven. This purgatory is between heaven and hell, and takes the place of the limbus patrum in the old dispensation, which contained the Jewish saints waiting for Christ, and was emptied when he descended for their deliverance: so purgatory will be finally emptied at the day of judgment. Much pious superstition and fraud collected around this mediæval theory, which explains the radical re-action at the time of the Reformation. See Purgatory.

(c) The Protestant churches rejected, with purgatory and its abuses, the whole idea of a middle state, and taught simply two states and places,—heaven for believers, and hell for unbelievers. Hades was identified with Gehenna, and hence both terms were translated alike in the Protestant versions. The same confusion gave rise also to misinterpretations of the article of Christ's descent in the Apostles' Creed, which was understood by Calvin (and the Heidelberg Catechism) figuratively, and with the sufferings on the cross; by the Westminster Catechism, as meaning simply that he continued in the state of death till he rose; by Luther, as a triumph over hell.

(d) In more recent times the idea of a middle state between death and resurrection, as distinct from the final state of heaven and hell, has been revived among Protestants, especially in Germany, though freed from the superstitions of the Roman purgatory, which has no foundation in the New Testament. To the believer (as to Lazarus in Abraham's bosom) this middle state is a state of beatitude in union with their Lord; to the unbeliever (as to the rich man in the parable) it is a state of punishment; to both a state of preparation for the final consummation at the day of judgment. Some assume a constant progress in that state in opposite directions, the good growing better, the bad worse, and both ripening for the final harvest. So Nitzsch, Lange, Rothe, Martensen, Rink. But all speculations on the future state beyond the limits of revelation are docta ignorantia.

Lit.—Jul. Fr. Bütcher: De inferis rebusque post mortem futuris ex Hebrorum et Graecorum opinionibus libri ii., Dresden, 1846; Oertel: Hades, 1883; Cremer: Biblisch-theol. Wörterbuch, sub ὑδρ.; Schenkell: Bibellexikon, vol. ii. 571 sqq.; Dr. Craven: Experiments in Lange's Com. on Revelation, Am. ed., 1874, pp. 304-8; further the elaborate discussion of all the passages on the subject, from which the author draws the conclusion that Hades, or the Old Testament Sheol rather, indicates a place distinct from the grave, from heaven, and from hell, and into which the souls of the righteous were conveyed after the death of Jesus, but from which they were delivered on his descent thereto, after the completion of his sacrifice on earth); Güder: Lehre von der Erscheinung Jesu Christi unter den Todten, Bern,
HADRACH.


PHILIP SCHELL.

HADRACH (חדרך, probably the Pausal of חדרך) is mentioned only in Zech. ix. 1: "Utterance of the word of Jahve concerning the land of Hadrach, and Damascus is its [the word's] place of rest." The connection seems to indicate that it was the country, in which Damascus was situated, or a neighboring locality. The following explanations have been suggested: It is (1) the name of a king (comp. Mic. v. 6; Neh. ix. 22); (2) of a god worshipped there (Ititzaig, Ewald, Reuss); (3) a symbolical designation meaning strong-weak, and refers to God (Jerome, hence Holy Land) or the Medo-Persian kingdom (Hengstenberg); (4) a designation of Cezarea, the word being taken as an adjective from חדרך (Maurer); (5) the name of a country, and is, on the basis of Assyrian inscriptions, to be identified with Hatarika (a city named in connection with Damascus which the Arabs know, but rather, as I think, with Chstracharta, near Ptolemais, which Strabo mentions (xi. 6, 6) as the residence ofarius Hystaspis; and (6) a name of Hauranitis (v. Ortenberg, Olshausen), the word being corrected to חדרך (Ezek. xlvii. 16, 18). See especially A. KöHLER: D. Weissagungen Sackarjas, 1863, for the various older interpretations, and Hadrach, in the Bible Diction. of WINER, RIEHM [and SMITH].

WOLFGABDUSIN.

HADRAN, P. EIUS, Roman emperor (117-138); was b. in Rome, Jan. 24, 76; of Spanish descent; a relative of Trajan, who adopted him on his death-bed. He was brilliantly gifted, and most carefully educated, a perfect soldier, ignorant of no art or science, possessed of a wonderful memory and a ready wit, handsome, and good-natured. But the elements of character were only loosely cemented; and, attracted in opposite directions, he finally lost himself in self-contradictions. He began his reign with abandoning the conquests of Trajan, — Mesopotamia, Assyria, and Armenia, — a measure hitherto unheard of in the annals of Rome. But his policy was to consolidate, not to extend, the empire; and the first condition for the success of such a policy was to procure strong natural boundary-lines. The period from 121 to 134 he spent in travelling about, looking after every thing himself, restoring what was decaying, and starting new undertakings. The number of buildings erected during his reign was enormous: and his influence on Roman legislation, affecting the state of the slaves, military affairs, the methods of legal procedure, the administration, etc., is very remarkable. But he returned to Rome stricken by an incurable disease, and haunted by melancholy. He died at Baits, July 10, 138, a burden to him by Quadratus and Aristides would, no doubt, have thrown full light on this question if they had come down to us; but they are lost; and the praelectiones of Rheims and of other Reformers, but was successively expelled from Zürich. Augsburg, Strassburg, etc., on account of his Anabaptist views, and was finally beheaded for bigamy at Constance, Feb. 3, 1529. In Strassburg he became acquainted with Duchs, and published together with him a translation of the Prophets (Worms, 1527), which was often reprinted. See KEIM: Lude. Heter, in Jahrb. der synod. Theol., 1856, pp. 215 sqq.

TH. KEIM.

HAFENREFFER, Matthias, a Lutheran divine, b. at Lorch, Württemberg, June 24, 1561; d. at Tübingen, Oct. 22, 1619; was appointed pastor at Ehningen 1588, court-preacher in Stuttgart 1590, professor of the law at Tübingen 1596. His Loci Theologici (1600) was the generally used textbook in Tübingen during the seventeenth century, and also introduced at other universities, as, for instance, at Upsala. His Tempium Excidere was still more celebrated in his own time. His correspondence with Kepler (in K. Opp., VIII., ed. Frisch) is very characteristic, and shows him as a quiet, cautious, but kind man. See THOLUCK: D. akad. Leben, i. 145; GASS: Gesch. d. protest. Dogm., i. 77 sqq. 

WAGENMANN.

HAQAR (ธาำ่, "flight"), an Egyptian, and bondwoman of Sarah, whom the latter, being barren, and following an ancient custom, gave to Abraham for a concubine. Her pregnancy aroused the jealousy of her mistress, and became the occasion of such harsh treatment, that she fled into the wilderness of Shur. At the well Beer-lahai-roi (Gen. xvi. 14) she was induced by
a theophany to return and submit. Hagar became the mother of Ishmael, but was again cast forth by Sarah, who in the mean time had given birth to Isaac (Gen. xxi. 9–11). She was again supernaturally visited in her distress (Gen. xxi. 11–21). Paul (Gal. iv. 24 sqq.), in an allegory, makes the slave Hagar the representative of the Law of Sinai, which “answered to the Jerusalem that added bondage” (Gal. iv. 24). In later Jewish thought Hagar (“stone”) in this passage to be simply a local name for Sinai, on which see Lightfoot, Galatians, pp. 190–195.

Hagarites, or Hagarenes, a people dwelling in Northern Arabia, with whom the trans-Jordanic tribes made war in the reign of Saul (Is. xliii. 6). See arts. in Smith's and Winer's Dictionaries.

Hagenbach, Karl Rudolf, a distinguished theological professor and church historian; b. in Basel, March 4, 1801; d. in the same city, June 7, 1874. After spending a year at the university of Basel, he went to Bonn and Berlin, where Schleiermacher and Neander exerted a large influence upon him in fixing his theological opinions. Returning to Basel in 1823 through the persuasions of De Wette, he taught as docent, and was soon made professor. In 1873 he celebrated the fiftieth jubilee of his connection with the university. During these years, besides his professorial duties, he wrote a good deal in books which had been begun in 534 (6. 36), but discontinued by King Josiah, after the death of the prophet, because he had been superseded by another child than Ishmael), although they are distinguished from the Ishmaelites (Ps. lxxxiii. 6). See arts. in Smith's and Winer's Dictionaries.

Hagenauc Conference of, a politically-religious conference called by Charles V. to Spires, and convened at Hagenauc on account of an epidemic raging in the former city; lasted from June 12 to July 16, 1540, but effected nothing with respect to the relation between Romanists and Protestants in Germany. The former were represented by Eck, Faber, and Cochlaeus; the latter by Osiander, Brenz, Capito, Cruciger, and Myconius. Only some preliminary questions were discussed, and a conference, to be held at Worms, was agreed upon.

Hagenauc, Conference of, a politico-religious conference called by Charles V. to Spires, and convened at Hagenauc on account of an epidemic raging in the former city; lasted from June 12 to July 16, 1540, but effected nothing with respect to the relation between Romanists and Protestants in Germany. The former were represented by Eck, Faber, and Cochlaeus; the latter by Osiander, Brenz, Capito, Cruciger, and Myconius. Only some preliminary questions were discussed, and a conference, to be held at Worms, was agreed upon.

Hagenbach, Karl Rudolf, a distinguished theological professor and church historian; b. in Basel, March 4, 1801; d. in the same city, June 7, 1874. After spending a year at the university of Basel, he went to Bonn and Berlin, where Schleiermacher and Neander exerted a large influence upon him in fixing his theological opinions. Returning to Basel in 1823 through the persuasions of De Wette, he taught as docent, and was soon made professor. In 1873 he celebrated the fiftieth jubilee of his connection with the university. During these years, besides his professorial duties, he wrote a good deal in books which had been begun in 534 (6. 36), but discontinued by King Josiah, after the death of the prophet, because he had been superseded by another child than Ishmael), although they are distinguished from the Ishmaelites (Ps. lxxxiii. 6). See arts. in Smith's and Winer's Dictionaries.

Hagga, like Zechariah and Malachi, the two other prophets after the Captivity, does not equal the earlier prophets in language and poetry. He is not, however, deficient in enthusiasm and originality (De Wette). A prophet is not to be measured by his power of description, but by the inherent value of what he utters, and by the purpose he is to subserve. The prophecies of these three prophets are the grand voices of watchmen in the morning watch of the old covenant.

It was Hagga's special office to predict the connection of redemption with the second temple, and of the Davidic dominion with the house of Zerubbabel (ii. 23). God did “give peace in that place” (ii. 9), for Jesus walked and taught in its...
HAIGIOGRAPHA.

HALDANE.

halls. Haggai prophesied of the new dispensation, and his words (ii. 9) are not applicable to a temple of stone. He was not a legalist; and the two legal questions (ii. 11-14) are put to bring out that the temple of stone does not exert any saving influence, and that it was the people that were sluggish in their work who corrupted every thing they touched. The period of Ezra and Nehemiah did not, but did inaugurate the discussion of it, which ultimately issued in the Talmud. The Old-Testament preparation for Christianity was negative, as well as positive. The legalism of the post-exile period was gradually transformed into Pharisaism, which brought death to Him whose advent the three post-exile prophets announced.

[For complete list of literature see MINOR PROPHETS.]

KOHLER: D. Weissag. Haggai's Erlangen, 1890; J. P. Lange: Der Prophet Haggai, Bielefeld, 1876, and McCurdy, in the American edition of Lange, N.Y., 1874; commentaries on Haggai and Zechariah, by J. VAN EATON, Pittsburg, published at Tiibingen, 12 vols., 1819 sqq. Many others; but an education for the general public avowal of his conversion to Baptist views. - HAHN, Johann Michael, was b. at Altendorf, in Prussian Saxon, March 27, 1792; d. at Breslau, May 13, 1868; studied theology and Oriental languages at Leipzig and Wittenberg, and was appointed professor at Konigberg 1819, at Leipzig 1826, at Breslau 1833, and superintendent-general of Silesia 1843. He was one of the last representatives of the old supranaturalism, and an ardent adversary of the reigning rationalism; but his works (Lehrbuch d. christl. Glaubens, 1827, etc.) are distinguished more by their warmth than by their acuteness. He also wrote on the Gnostics, De gnost. Marcionis (1820), Antheseis Marcionis (1825), De canone Marcionis (1826), etc.]

HAHN, Johann Michael, was b. at Altendorf, in Wurttemberg, Feb. 2, 1758, the son of a peasant. From early youth he received very deep religious impressions, and was given to meditations. He studied the Bible, also the works of Jacob Boehme, Oetinger, and other authors, and he was ordained pastor of a newl organized independent church in Edinburgh. In 1801 Robert built for the congregation a fine edifice, afterwards known as the Tabernacle. Here James labored for nearly fifty years with excellent success. In 1808 he made public avowal of his conversion to Baptist views. - HAHN, August, b. at Grossosterhausen, in Prussian Saxony, March 27, 1792; d. at Breslau, May 13, 1868; studied theology and Oriental languages at Leipzig and Wittenberg, and was appointed professor at Konigberg 1819, at Leipzig 1826, at Breslau 1833, and superintendent-general of Silesia 1843. He was one of the last representatives of the old supranaturalism, and an ardent adversary of the reigning rationalism; but his works (Lehrbuch d. christl. Glaubens, 1827, etc.) are distinguished more by their warmth than by their acuteness. He also wrote on the Gnostics, De gnost. Marcionis (1820), Antheseis Marcionis (1825), De canone Marcionis (1826), etc.

HAHN, Johann Michael, was b. at Altendorf, in Wurttemberg, Feb. 2, 1758, the son of a peasant. From early youth he received very deep religious impressions, and was given to meditations. He studied the Bible, also the works of Jacob Boehme, Oetinger, and other authors, and he was ordained pastor of a newl organized independent church in Edinburgh. In 1801 Robert built for the congregation a fine edifice, afterwards known as the Tabernacle. Here James labored for nearly fifty years with excellent success. In 1808 he made public avowal of his conversion to Baptist views. - HAHN, August, b. at Grossosterhausen, in Prussian Saxony, March 27, 1792; d. at Breslau, May 13, 1868; studied theology and Oriental languages at Leipzig and Wittenberg, and was appointed professor at Konigberg 1819, at Leipzig 1826, at Breslau 1833, and superintendent-general of Silesia 1843. He was one of the last representatives of the old supranaturalism, and an ardent adversary of the reigning rationalism; but his works (Lehrbuch d. christl. Glaubens, 1827, etc.) are distinguished more by their warmth than by their acuteness. He also wrote on the Gnostics, De gnost. Marcionis (1820), Antheseis Marcionis (1825), De canone Marcionis (1826), etc.

HAHN, Johann Michael, was b. at Altendorf, in Wurttemberg, Feb. 2, 1758, the son of a peasant. From early youth he received very deep religious impressions, and was given to meditations. He studied the Bible, also the works of Jacob Boehme, Oetinger, and other authors, and he was ordained pastor of a newl organized independent church in Edinburgh. In 1801 Robert built for the congregation a fine edifice, afterwards known as the Tabernacle. Here James labored for nearly fifty years with excellent success. In 1808 he made public avowal of his conversion to Baptist views. - HAHN, August, b. at Grossosterhausen, in Prussian Saxony, March 27, 1792; d. at Breslau, May 13, 1868; studied theology and Oriental languages at Leipzig and Wittenberg, and was appointed professor at Konigberg 1819, at Leipzig 1826, at Breslau 1833, and superintendent-general of Silesia 1843. He was one of the last representatives of the old supranaturalism, and an ardent adversary of the reigning rationalism; but his works (Lehrbuch d. christl. Glaubens, 1827, etc.) are distinguished more by their warmth than by their acuteness. He also wrote on the Gnostics, De gnost. Marcionis (1820), Antheseis Marcionis (1825), De canone Marcionis (1826), etc. - HALACHAH (norm) is the traditional oral law, embodied in sententious form, contained in the Midrash; which see.

HALDANE, James Alexander, and Robert, brothers, eminent for Christian zeal. They studied at the High School and University of Edinburgh. — I. James was b. at Dundee, July 14, 1788; d. Feb. 8, 1851. In 1785 he entered the navy, but, becoming serious on the subject of religion, returned to Edinburgh. In 1797 and 1798 he travelled through Scotland and the Orkney Islands, preaching to large audiences, and with good results, and in 1799 was ordained pastor of a newly organized independent church in Edinburgh. In 1801 Robert built for the congregation a fine edifice, afterwards known as the Tabernacle. Here James labored for nearly fifty years with excellent success. In 1808 he made public avowal of his conversion to Baptist views. - II. Robert was b. in London, Feb. 28, 1764; d. in Edinburgh, Dec. 12, 1842. He was in the navy from 1780 to 1783. Having inherited a large property, he settled in 1785 on his estate at Airthrey. From the year 1785, when he became deeply interested on the subject of religion, he was one of the most influential Christian philanthropists and writers of Scotland. Within fifteen years he distributed three hundred and fifty thousand dollars for charitable purposes, and during his life educated three hundred ministers at an expense of a hundred thousand dollars. The years 1816 and 1817 he spent in Geneva and Montauban. At Geneva he opened his parlors in the evening to the theological students of the University, and expounded the Epistle to the Romans. These meetings attracted large audiences of students; and such men as Merle d'Aubigné, Malan, Gaus sen, were led by them to adopt evangelical views. Mr. Haldane pursued the same course at Montauban. His lectures were embodied in his Com ent sur l'Epreuve aux Romains, which appeared in 1819. After his return to Scotland, Mr. Haldane con-

HALE, Matthew, Sir, Lord Chief Justice of England; b. at Alderley, Nov. 1, 1609; d. there Dec. 25, 1676. Graduated at Magdalen College, Oxford, he was intending to enter the ministry, when suddenly turned his attention to the study of law. He signed the Solemn League and Covenant, and was a member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines (1643). He sat in Parliament several times; was appointed judge by Cromwell, and was knighted immediately after the Restoration (1660). He was a man of prodigious industry in the study of law, and an upright judge. Baxter says of him that he "was most precisely just, insomuch that I believe he would have lost all he had in the world rather than do an unjust act." His name has a place among the best judicial decisions. In 1665, at Bury St. Edmund's, he condemned two prisoners to death on this charge. He was on intimate terms with Baxter, Stillingfleet, and other celebrated divines. His principal religious works are, Contemplations, Moral and Divine; Of the Nature of True Religion, 1684; Brief Abstract of the Christian Religion, 1668. An edition of his Moral and Religious Works, edited by Thirlwall, appeared in London, 1805, 2 vols. (containing Bishop Burnet's Life). His Life was first written by Bishop Burnet, and since by J. B. Williams (Lond., 1839) and Lord Campbell, in his Lives of the Chief Justices.

HALE, John, "the ever-memorable;" b. at Bath, April 1584; d. at Eton, May 19, 1656. He was Greek professor at Oxford (1612), and canon of Windsor (1639). His works were posthumously published by Bishop Burnet (Lond., 1659, best ed., 1673, modern ed., 1765, 3 vols.). They consist of sermons and miscellanies; but appended to the volume are his Letters from the Synod of Dort, 1618 (which he attended, and as the result of which he became an Arminian), together with the Acts of the Synod; so that the Appendix is of great historical value.

Hales, William, D.D., chronologist; d. as rector of Killeshandra, Ireland, Jan. 30, 1731. His New Analysis of Chronology appeared London, 1806-14, 4 vols., 2d ed., 1830, of which vols. 2 and 3 were occupied with Scripture chronology, in which department he is still an authority.

HALF-COMMUNION, when only the bread is given, as in the Roman-Catholic Church.

HALF-WAY COVENANT, an expedient adopted in New-England Congregational churches, between 1637 and 1692, of allowing baptized persons of moral life and orthodox belief to belong to the church so far as to receive baptism for their children, and all the privileges but that of the Lord's Supper for themselves. See Congregationalism, p. 538.

HALL, Gordon, a Congregationalist, the first American missionary to Bombay; b. at West Granville (now Tolland), Mass., April 8, 1784; d. of cholera, Bombay, March 20, 1826. He was graduated from Williams College 1808, studied theology, was ordained as a missionary to India, and arrived at Bombay 1813. For thirteen years he prosecuted his labor with diligence and success. He had just finished the revision of the Multidatta version of the New Testament when he died. Besides a few pamphlets, he wrote, in connection with Samuel Newell, The Conversion of the World, or the Claims of Six Hundred Millions, Andover, 1818. See his Memoir by H. Bardwell, And., 1854.

HALL, John Vine, b. at Diss, Norfolk, Eng., March 14, 1774; d. at Maidstone, Sept. 92 1860. He was a prominent advocate of total abstinence, and the author of The Sinner's Friend (1821). He lived to see 260 editions of the tract printed in 23 languages, and comprising 1,268,000 copies. He distributed 60,000 copies. See his Autobiography edited by his son, Rev. Newman Hall of London (New York, 1855).

HALL, Joseph, a learned divine, and eloquent preacher of the Church of England; b. in Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Leicestershire, July 1, 1674; d. at Higham, near Norfolk, Sept. 8, 1686. His mother was a pious woman, and dedicated him early to the ministry. Graduating at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, he was for two successive years lecturer on rhetoric, and became rector of Halsted, Suffolk, in 1601, from which he passed in 1612 to Waltham Holy Cross. In 1616 he accompanied the Earl of Carlisle on his mission to France, and in 1617 James I. to Scotland. Upon this monarch he lavished, like many of his contemporaries, the grossest adulation. In the sermon on the anniversary of the king's inauguration (March 24, 1613, and printed under the title A Holy Panegyric) he exhausted the English language for laudatory epithets. In 1617 he was made Dean of Worcester, and in 1618 was sent by James, as one of his commissioners, to the synod of Dort. The Latin sermon is still preserved which he preached before that body (Nov. 28, 1618). He was a moderate Calvinist, and sought for a mean between Calvinism and Arminianism, and published a tract (1622) on the subject Via media, the way of peace. In 1627 Dr. Hall was promoted to the see of Exeter, having previously (1624) declined that of Gloucester, and in 1641 was transferred to Norwich. Under Laud he was accused of puritanical leanings, and he was so stung by these accusations that he threatened "to cast up his rochet." He abundantly proved his full attachment to the Church of England in his Episcopacy by Divine Right Asserted (1840). In this work he advocates episcopacy as a form of government recommended by the apostles. Under the Long Parliament he seems to have suffered severely, and was one of the eleven bishops to be imprisoned in the Tower. He was released after a confinement of six months in 1642, but the following year suffered the sequestration of the revenues of his see; an allowance, however, being granted him by Parliament. He has given an account of his trials during this period in his Hard Measure (1647). The latter years of his life he spent in retirement at Higham.

Bishop Hall was a man of broad and tolerant sympathies, much piety, and in the pulpit has
BALL.

had few equals for eloquence among English preachers of the Established Church. Of his manner in the pulpit he says, "I never durst to climb into the pulpit to preach any sermon whereof I had not before, in my poor plain fashion, penned every word in the same order wherein I hoped to deliver it," etc. He was a prolific author, and began his literary career by a volume of Satires (1597, 1598), which are among the first in the English language. He wrote several controversial works, among which, in addition to the one on episcopacy mentioned above, was a treatise exposing the corruptions of the Church of Rome under the title The Old Religion (1629). His most valuable works, however, are of a devotional character, and have suggested to Mr. Hall the propriety of a comparison between their author and Jeremy Taylor. The Contemplations upon the N. Test. (1612-15), Meditations and Voces (1624), and Explication of all the Hard Texts of the whole divine Scripture (1634), are his principal practical writings. Complete editions of his works by Rev. Josiah Pratt, London, 1808, 10 vols., and Rev. Peter Hall, Oxford, 1839, 12 vols. See Rev. John Jones: Bishop Hall, his Life and Times, London, 1828, which contains the bishop's own Observations on some specialties of divine Providence in his life.

HALL, Robert, one of the most eloquent of modern preachers; b. May 2, 1764, at Arnsby, Leicestershire, where his father, known as the author of a work entitled Zion's Travellers, was pastor of a Baptist church; and on leaving the northern university he was appointed classical tutor in the Bristol seminary, an office which he held, in conjunction with his assistantship, for five years. A misunderstanding between the two pastors decided him to resign both his positions in Bristol, and he went in 1778 to the Baptist seminary in Bristol to prepare himself for the ministry. While still a student, he was ordained in 1780; and in 1781 he went to King's College, Cambridge, in 1790. Here he remained for fifteen years, increasing in influence and reputation, and already recognized as one of the foremost preachers of his day. His first published sermon appeared in 1791, and was followed at intervals by others, which proved him to be not only an eloquent orator, but also an earnest advocate of liberty and education. But two attacks of insanity, with but a brief interval between them, caused him to leave Cambridge; and in 1806 he removed to Leicester, where he labored for twenty years, when, at the call of the Broadmead Church, he returned to Bristol to finish his ministry where it was begun, for there he died.

Throughout the greater part of his life Hall was a martyr to the severest physical sufferings; and the spirit which he manifested under it, together with the work which he forced himself to do in spite of it, entitled him to be ranked among the heroes of his age. In theological opinion he was at first unsettled; but ultimately he became a Calvinist, after the type of Andrew Fuller, and was one of the ablest assailants of Socinianism. On the subject of communion he was opposed to Fuller, and his treatise on it is among the ablest of his works. He was an earnest supporter of the missionary enterprise; and through the pages of the Eclectic Review, as well as by his published sermons on Modern Infidelity, Popular Ignorance, and Christianity Consistent with a Love of Freedom, he did much to liberalize the opinions of his generation. He was eminent as a conversationalist; and some able men have left accounts of their interviews with him, which remind us a little of the talk of Johnson as reported by Boswell. But though he had all the quickness, and some of the roughness, of the gruff lexicographer, he had little of his self-sufficiency, and had now and then a pathos that was all his own. His special pre-eminence, however, was in the pulpit. He spoke without notes, but not without preparation; for he admitted that most of his great sermons were first worked out in thought, and then elaborated in the very words in which they were delivered. He could repeat them verbatim after the lapse of years; and though it was affirmed by many that his perorations were impromptu, he declared that they were the most carefully studied parts of his discourses. In his printed sermons his style is characterized by energy clothed in elegance, and moving on in a certain rhythmical steadiness; in his spoken discourse there was a severer simplicity: but in both there was perfect clearness. His manner was that of one who was entirely absorbed in his subject, and was quite unconscious of his mode of utterance. At first his voice was so low as to be scarcely audible, and there seemed to be a little hesitation in his delivery; but soon his oratory overcame, and he poured forth with wonderful fluency, and unsurpassed command of language, a continuous stream of eloquence. Now it was description, now it was argument, now it was apostrophe, and now it was appeal; but it was always quiet, always clear, and always cogent. He had very little action. His usual attitude was to stand with his chest leaning against the cushion, and his left arm resting on the Bible, while his right was slightly raised. But such was the impression produced by his words, that, before he had spoken many minutes, all thought of the man and his manner disappeared from the hearer's mind, and he felt himself face to face with the subject alone. His fame, great while he lived, has become a cherished tradition among English-speaking Christians, and his works are among the classics of the modern pulpit.

Lit.—Works of Robert Hall, M.A., with a brief Memoir of his Life, by Oliphant Gregory, LL.D., Lond., 6 vols., N.Y., 4 vols.; Reminiscences of Robert Hall, by John Greene, Lond., 1832; Biographical Recollections of Robert Hall, by J. W. Morris, 1846; Fifty Sermons of Robert Hall, from notes taken by Rev. Thomas Griffield, 1843; Remi-
HALLEL.

Ps. cxiii.-cxviii. are so named because each of them begins with Hallelujah; also called the Egyptian allelu, because "it was chanted in the temple during the slaught-

eralm, according to the enactment first made in Egypt." They were sung, according to rabbinical enactment, on the first of the month, and at the feasts of Dedication, Tabernacles, Weeks, and the Passover. On the last occa-

casion, Psalms cxiii. and cxiv., according to the school of Hallel (Ps. cxiii. only, according to the school of Shamai), were sung before the feast, and the others at the close, after the last cup. The "hymn" which our Lord and his disciples sang after the Last Supper (Matt. xxvi. 30) was the second part of the Hallel (Ps. cxv.-cxvi).

Hallel'jah (חֱלֹלָה), "Praise ye Jah". It stands at the beginning, or close, or both, of many psalms in the Hebrew (e.g., civ. 35. civ. 1, 48, civ. 19), and therefore naturally became a formula of praise, and was chanted as such on solemn days of rejoicing (cf. Rev. xix. 1, 5, 6). The psalms in which it occurs are all in the last book of the collection, and apparently were intended for temple use. Hallelujah passed over into the Christian Church as a dox-
lology, the more readily since it was a word adapted to singing. It was used especially at Easter. In the Greek Church it is used "not on days of gladness, but more constantly on occasions of mourning and fasting and burials."

In the Book of Common Prayer it is translated, "Laud and n.Y., 1881. WILLIAM n. TAYLOR.

HALLEY, Robert, a distinguished preacher and scholar among the Congregationalists of England; on his father's side of Scotch descent; b. at Blackheath, near London, Aug. 13, 1790; d. at Arundel, Surrey, Aug. 18, 1876. He received an excellent classical education at Bere Regis, afterwards at Greenwich, and received his theological instruction at Hamerton College, London. He was probably the last nonconformist minister who found it necessary, when preaching as a student, to receive a license from a magistrate under the provisions of the Toleration Act. He was ordained pastor of the church at "The Old Meeting," St. Neots, Huntingdonshire, June 11, 1822. Here he also taught a school. In 1826 he became classical tutor at Highbury College, London. While here he took active part in the antiislamic movement and in the Unitarian controversy. His letter to Mr. Tate, entitled The Improved Version Truly Designated a Creed (Lon-
don, 1834), led to his receiving the degree of D.D. from Princeton. In 1839 he was invited to suc-
cceed Dr. McAll as pastor of the Moesley-street Chapel, Manchester, whence, nine years later, he removed to the new building, which became necessary for the growth of the church, in Cavendish Street of the same city. In 1843 and 1850 he delivered his two courses of Congregational Lectures on the Sacraments,—a very able, learned, and candid work. In 1847 he published a small volume on Baptism. In 1857 he was invited to the chair of professor of theology, and the position of principal in New College, London, which he occupied for fifteen years. Here he published his History of Puritanism and Nonconformity in Lancashire,—one of the most graphic and interesting pictures of Puritan life. He retired from the college in 1872. He was one of the ablest platform-speakers of his time. Ardent, witty, exceedingly fair to opponents, he produced most wonderful effects upon general audiences. His eulogy upon Abraham Lincoln at a meeting of the Congregational Union of England and Wales was an extraordinary instance of oratorical power and polemical effect.

HALLOCK, William Allen, b. in Plainfield, Mass., June 2, 1794; d. in New-York City, Sat-

day, Oct. 2, 1880. He was graduated at Williams College 1819, and at Andover Theological Semi-

nary 1822; entered the service of the New-Eng-

tland Tract Society at Boston, and in 1825 took a

prominent part in organizing the American Tract

Society, of which he was the first secretary, and for forty-five years served the society in this ca-
pacity with rare fidelity and ability. Under his fostering care its publications year by year in-
creased in number and usefulness. He edited the American Messenger for many years, and wrote Lives of Rev. Dr. Justin Edwards and Harlan

Page, besides several excellent tracts. It has been calculated, that, of his own publications, nearly a million and a half copies have been cir-

culated. See his Memorial, by Mrs. H. C. Knight,

New York, 1882.

HALSEY, Luther, D.D., LL.D., b. at Schenec-
tady, N.Y., Jan. 1, 1794; d. at New York, Penn., Friday, Oct. 29, 1880. He was professor of the-
ology in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Allegheny, Penn., 1829-37, and in the latter year went to the chair of ecclesiastical history and
HAMILTON.

church policy in Auburn Theological Seminary, but resigned in 1844. From 1847 to 1850 he acted as professor of church history in the Union Theological Seminary, New-York City. For several years before his death he lived in retirement.

HAYBURTON, Thomas, b. at Duplin, near Perth, Dec. 25, 1874; professor of divinity at St. Andrew's, 1710; d. there Sept. 23, 1712. He wrote, The Great Concern of Salvation (published by the Presbyterian Board, Philadelphia), Natural Religion Insufficient, etc., also an Autobiography (Edinburgh, 1716), which has been several times republished (e.g., London, 1824). See the edition of his works by Rev. Robert Burns, D.D., London, 1835.

HAM, See Noah.

Haman the Agagite. See Esther.

HAMANN, Johann Georg, b. in Königsberg, Aug. 27, 1730; d. at Münster, June 20, 1781; received a somewhat desultory education; studied ancient literature and languages, philology and belles-lettres, at the university of his native city 1745–51; went to Courland as tutor in a private family; became acquainted with the great mercantile house of Berens in Riga, began to study national economy, and made, in the service of the house and for some mercantile purpose, a journey to England. In London he fell in with bad company, and was cheated of his money. In his destitution he took to the Bible; and a conversion followed, deep and complete. After a short visit to Riga, he settled in Königsberg 1759; held first a small office in the administration, afterwards a better one in the custom-house, and devoted himself to literature. His books (Biblische Betrachtungen, Gedanken über meinen Lebenslauf, Golgotha, und Schebbimini, etc.) are mostly small pamphlets; but they made a deep impression, and procured for him the name of the "Magus of the North." They are queer, dense obscurity and lightningslike clearness, full of allusions and powerful thoughts of universal import, alternating with each other; but they are full of stirring suggestiveness. His last years he spent in the circles of Jacobi and the Princess Galitzin. A collected edition of his works, in eight volumes, by F. Roth, appeared in Berlin, 1821–43. Selections from his works were made by A. W. Müller, Münster, 1826. See GILDEMEISTER: Hamanns Leben u. Schriften, 1857–68, 5 vols.; J. Dieselhof: Wegweiser zu J. G. H., Kaiserswerth, 1871; PETRI: Hamanns Schriften und Briefe, Hanover, 1872–74, 4 vols; HUGO: Lichterstahlen aus Hamanns Schriften, 1873; G. POEL: Johann Georg Hamann, Hamburg, 1874–76, 2 parts.

Hamath (Heb. "fortress," "Epis, now Hamath") has from the oldest times, and down to our days, been one of the most important cities of Syria. Situated among the northern spurs of the Lebanon (Josh. xiii. 5; Judg. iii. 8), in the narrow but well-watered and exceedingly fertile valley of the Orontes, and having easy connections to the south with Damascus (Zech. ix. 2; Jer. xxxii. 28), and to the east with Zoabah (1 Chron. xvii. 8; 2 Kings xiv. 9), there were principal stations on the commercial and military road from Phenicia to the Euphrates. It was originally a Canaanite colony (Gen. xiv. 18), but was afterwards taken by the Syrians. With a small territory comprising the city of Riblah (2 Kings xxiii. 38, xxx. 21), it formed an independent state under a king, and maintained at various periods various relations with the Jewish state. In the time of Hezekiah it was taken by the Assyrians (2 Kings xvii. 34, xix. 19; Isa. x. 9, xxxvi. 9); and "men from Hamath" were carried to Samaria, and settled there in place of the Israelites (2 Kings xvii. 24, 30). In the middle ages it was again the capital of a small independent state. The celebrated historian and geographer Abulfeda (d. 1331) lived there. At present it has about thirty thousand inhabitants. Not to be confounded with this Hamath is that belonging to the tribe of Naphtali (Josh. xiii. 35). Four stones covered with as yet undeciphered inscriptions were found at Hamath. The writing is probably Hittite. See HITTITE.

Hamburg, with a territory comprising an area of 138 square miles, contained, according to the census of 1877, a population of 406,014, of which about 80 per cent were Lutherans, 13,796 were Jews, 7,771 Roman Catholics, and 5,936 belonged to other evangelical denominations. When Hamburg, in 1529, adopted the Reformation, the church constitution excluded all who were not Lutherans from the city and its territory. In 1687 members of the Dutch Reformed Church, and in 1648, by the peace of Westphalia, Roman Catholics were allowed to live in the city; but they could not become citizens, nor could they celebrate worship in public. By the new civil constitution of Sept. 25, 1860, religious liberty was introduced, and all civil disqualifications from religious regard abolished. The Lutheran Church is governed by a synod consisting of fifty-three members; namely, thirty-five laymen, sixteen ecclesiastics, and two senators, and elected by the congregations. The ecclesiastical council, consisting of nine members, four laymen, three ecclesiastics and two senators, and chosen by the synod, has the executive power, and carries on the whole administration.

Hameel. See BAJUS.

Hamelmann, Hermann, b. at Osnabriick, 1525; d. in Oldenburg, June 20, 1565; was educated in the Roman-Catholic religion, and curate of Camen, but embraced the Reformation 1552, and labored with great success for its progress as superintendent-general in Brunswick 1568–72, and Oldenburg 1573–95. Of his works (forty-five in number) is Opera genealogico-historica de Westphalia et Saxonia inferiori (edited by Waserbach, Lemgo, 1711) are of great interest. His Life was written by RAUSCHENBUSCH, Schwelm, 1830, and CLEMEN: D. Einführung d. Ref. zu Lemgo, Lemgo, 1847.

Hamilton, James, D.D., eminent Presbyterian divine; b. at Lonend, Paisley, Scotland, Nov. 27, 1814; came to London, 1841, as pastor of the National Scotch Church, Regent's Square; d. there Nov. 24, 1867. He was an acknowledged master of pulpit oratory, and author of some of the most widely circulated books of his day. Of his Life in Earnest (1844), sixty-four thousand had been sold before 1852, and, of his Mount of Olives, sixty-four thousand before 1853. Besides these, he wrote The Royal Preacher (1851), an excellent homiletical commentary upon Ecclesiastes; The Lamp and the Lantern (1858), later title The Light...

HAMILTON, Patrick, the proto-martyr of the Scottish Reformation; b. about 1503-04, at Stane-side, Lanark, or Kincavel, Linlithgow; buried at St. Andrew's on Feb. 29, 1528. His father was a natural son of the first Lord Hamilton, knighted for his bravery, and rewarded with the above lands and barony, by his sovereign, James IV. His mother was a daughter of Alexander, Duke of Albany, second son of James II.; so that he was closely connected with some of the highest families in the land. His cousins, John and James Hamilton, before the Reformation, rose to episcopal rank in the old church; and several others of his relatives attained high promotion. Destined himself for such promotion, Patrick was carefully educated, and, according to the corrupt custom of the times, was in his fourteenth year appointed to the abbacy of Ferne in Ross-shire, to enable him, maturing in the principles of scholasticism, to attain such results in ecclesiastical dignity as might seem to stand in need of reform. At this date he was probably more of an Erasmian than a Lutheran, though of that more naturally cruel, or likely, after his recent misfortunes, to desire to embroil himself in a quarrel with the powerful Hamiltons. But he had those about him, particularly his nephew the future cardinal, who were more relentless, and less careful of consequences, and so far he yielded to their wishes. Still he was anxious to perform the ungrateful task in the least offensive way; and by issuing, or threatening to issue, a summons charging him with heresy, he got rid of the Reformer, for a time, without imbruing his hands in his blood. Hamilton, yielding to the counsels of friends and opponents, made his escape to the Continent. His original intention had been to visit Luther and Melanchthon at Wittenberg, as well as Frith, Tyndale and Lambert, at Marburg. But Dr. Merie d'Aubigné says that the plague was then raging at Wittenberg, and that he went straight to the newly opened university of Marburg, over which Lambert presided, and that he publicly disputed there those theses as to the law and gospel which fully set forth the main doctrines which he taught, and for which at last he suffered. He had much profitable intercourse with Tyndale, as well as with Lambert, and was urged to remain in that quiet refuge. But he yearned over his native land, still in darkness and the shadow of death; and, late in the autumn of 1527, he returned to it, determined to brave death itself, rather than prove faithless to his Master where before he had shrunk from an ordeal so terrible. Nor was it long ere his resolution was put to the test. After he had labored for a very short time in his native district, gained over to the truth several of his relatives, and won the heart of a young lady of noble birth, to whom he united himself in marriage, he was invited by the archbishop to a conference with the chiefs of the church as might seem to stand in need of reform. At all displayed a conciliatory spirit, and appeared to recognize the evils existing in the church; some even went so far as to share his sentiments, and for nearly a month all possible freedom in making known his views was allowed to him. At length the mask was thrown aside. On Feb. 28 he was seized, and on the 29th
brought out for trial in the cathedral. Among the articles with which he was charged and the truth of which he maintained, the more important were, "that a man is not justified by works, but by faith; that faith, hope, and charity are so linked together, that he who hath one of them hath all, and he that lacketh one lacketh all; and that good works make not a good man, but a good man doeth good works." On being challenged by his accuser, he also affirmed it was not lawful to worship images, nor to pray to the saints; and that it was "lawful to all men that have souls to read the word of God; and that they are able to understand the same, and in particular the latter will and testament of Jesus Christ." These truths, which have been the source of life and strength to many, were then to him the cause of condemnation and death; and the same day the sentence was passed, it was remorselessly executed. But, through all his excruciating sufferings, the martyr held fast his confidence in God and in his Saviour; and the faith of many in the truths he taught was only the more confirmed by witnessing their mighty power with him. 

As described as a "solitary student" (Veitch's Life, p. 42). When passing his examination, he professed the whole works of Aristotle, and results showed that his study of the Stagirite had been careful and minute. Hamilton turned to the legal profession, passing for the Scotch bar in 1813. Shortly after, he established his claim to the baronetcy of Hamilton of Preston, and was thenceforth known as Sir William. He twice visited Germany during the years following, but does not seem by these visits to have made the acquaintance of any noted philosophers. In 1829 he became a candidate for the chair of moral philosophy in Edinburgh University, vacant by the death of Thomas Brown. He was supported in his candidature by Dugald Stewart, the senior professor of the chair, and was at the beginning of his second term. 

Hamilton's life are the notices in the Commentary of Alesius on Ps. xxxvii., and in the Introduction to Lambert's Commentary on the Apocalypse, in the Acts and Monuments of Foxe, in the Histories of Knox, Calderwood, Spottiswoode, and in the Chronicle of Lindsay of Pitscottie. The only formal biography of the martyr is that published in our own day by the late principal Lorimer, and intended to form the first of a series on the "Precursors of Knox." Its title is Patrick Hamilton, the First Preacher and Martyr of the Scottish Reformation: a Historical Biography, collected from original sources, etc., Edinburgh, 1857. The story of the martyr has since been told, in his own dramatic way, by Dr. Merle d'Aubigné, in vol. vi. of his Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin. Still more recently it has been made the subject of a veritable drama by Rev. T. P. Johnston, Patrick Hamilton, a Tragedy of the Reformation in Scotland, Edinburgh, 1882.
and Herbert Spencer (First Principles, chap. IV., § 24),— and presenting an insuperable difficulty to the opponents of introspection. In the midst of the conflict connected with the conception of consciousness, consciousness itself is certainty,—the province within which scepticism is impossible.

Hamilton's theory of external perception, in which he maintains that the external object is within consciousness, has not gained much support.

Hamilton's law of the conditioned, with a relative philosophy of the unconditioned, is that which comes into nearest relation with theology. His law of the conditioned is, "that all that is conceivable in thought lies between two extremes, which, as contradictory of each other, cannot both be true, but of which, as mutually contradictory, one must" (Metaph., II. 368, Lect. 35). "The law of the mind, that the conceivable is in every relation bounded by the inconceivable, I call the law of the conditioned" (p. 373). This involved his position as to the Infinite,—that the Infinite is "incognizable and inconceivable." The attempt to explain the phenomena of these relations, Kant had made a priori elements only forms of the mind; and accordingly the ideas of self, the universe, and God, became only regulative of our intellectual procedure, and in no sense guaranties of truth. Accordingly Kant has dwelt on "the self-contradiction of seemingly dogmatical cognitions (thesis cum antithesi) in none of which we can discover both be true, but of which, as mutually contradictory, one must" (Metaph., II. 368, Lect. 35). "The law of the mind, that the conceivable is in every relation bounded by the inconceivable, I call the law of the conditioned" (p. 373). This involved his position as to the Infinite,—that the Infinite is "incognizable and inconceivable." The attempt to explain the phenomena of these relations, Kant had made a priori elements only forms of the mind; and accordingly the ideas of self, the universe, and God, became only regulative of our intellectual procedure, and in no sense guaranties of truth. Accordingly Kant has dwelt on "the self-contradiction of seemingly dogmatical cognitions (thesis cum antithesi) in none of which we can discover both be true, but of which, as mutually contradictory, one must" (Metaph., II. 368, Lect. 35). "The law of the mind, that the conceivable is in every relation bounded by the inconceivable, I call the law of the conditioned" (p. 373).

This doctrine of ignorance was developed by Mansel (Limits of Religious Thought), and eagerly embraced by the experientialists, J. S. Mill (Essay of Hamilton's Philos., chap. IV.) and Herbert Spencer (First Principles, Pt. I.; The Unknowable, chap. IV.; The Relativity of All Knowledge). This gave an impulse to agnosticism, the influence of which must be largely credited to Kant, who conduced the a priori to a form of mental procedure, and to Hamilton, who rejected Kant's view, yet regarded the absolute as inconceivable. See Agnosticism. For an understanding of Hamilton's position the following references may suffice:

"Mind rises to its highest dignity when viewed as the object through which, and through which alone, our unassisted reason can ascend to the knowledge of God" (Metaph., Lect. II.). "The notion of a God is not contained in the notion of a mere First Cause," nor is the notion completed by adding "the attribute of omnipotence." "Not until the two great attributes of intelligence and virtue are brought in "have we "the belief in a veritable Divinity;" to which statement it is added, by way of exposition, "that virtue involves liberty" (ib.). "The assertion of theism is "the assertion that the universe is created by intelligence, and governed not only by physical, but by moral laws" (ib.). From these passages it is obvious, that, when Hamilton is discussing the rational explanation of the universe, he speaks unreservedly of "the knowledge of God," "meditately through his works," interchanging "knowledge" and "belief" in his statements. But when he treats of the limits of knowledge, the law of the conditioned, the inconceivability of the unconditioned, he denies the possibility of knowledge, and makes faith the only possible exercise. "The infinite God cannot by us, in the present limitation of our faculties, be comprehended or conceived" (Metaph., Lect. 38). He adds, however, "We know God according to the finitude of our faculties;" but "faith — belief — is the organ by which we apprehend what is beyond our knowledge." In judging of this, two things are to be noticed: that he reasons from conception to knowledge, not vice versa; that his mind conceives, and consequently can know only the limited (Discussions, Essay I.),—and that he makes faith a cognitive power.

Lit. — Hamilton's Works: Discussions (1852), Reid's Works, with Notes and Dissertations (1846), completed, 1883), Lectures on Metaphysics and Logic (1859). See also Memoir of Professor Veitch; Mansel's Limits of Reli-
HAMMOND, Henry, D.D., a learned divine; b. at Chertsey in Surrey, Eng., Aug. 26, 1605; d. at Westwood, Worcestershire, April 25, 1680. He was a fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, 1625, chaplain to Charles I., imprisoned in Oxford, freed, and lived out his days in privacy. He was a man of the very highest character. Dr. Fell expatiates at great length, but without that great weight of authority in which all he seems to have had in the profession. He never married; although, according to Dr. Fell, he twice felt strongly inclined to. He was nominated one of the Westminster Assembly of divines, but never sat among them; and his nomination was soon afterwards revoked because of his loyalty to the Stuart's cause. Among his works, the best are A Practical Catechism (1644), Paraphrase and Annotations upon the New Testament (1653, reprinted Oxford, 1645, 4 vols.), Upon the Book of Psalms (1659, reprinted Oxford, 1650, 2 vols.), and upon the First Chapters of Proverbs. His Catechism appeared anonymously in a small edition at Oxford, and did not attract much notice until the appearance of the second edition (1646), when it suddenly leaped into such popularity that fifteen editions were printed before 1715; it covers 178 pages of the folio edition of Hammond's works. But of more importance is his Paraphrase, in which he reveals genuine exegetical tact and learning. That on the New Testament was translated into Latin, and annotated by LeClerc, Amsterdam, 1698. His Life was written by Bishop John Fell, London, 1661. His complete works were published London, 1645–57, 4 vols. folio; his Miscellaneous Theological Works, in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, Oxford, 1847–50, 3 vols. 8vo. Both these editions of his works contain Fell's Life.

HAMPTON, John, b. at Cherbourg, 1618; d. in Port-Royal, Feb. 22, 1687; studied medicine in Paris, and began to practise with great success, but sold in 1651 all his property, distributed the money among the poor, and became a hermit in Port-Royal. Of his numerous acetic writings the principal are, Traité de pied, Pratique de la prière continue, and an autobigraphy of Augustine's Confessions, Lettres et opuscules, etc. The best life of him is found in Besioigne: Histoire de l'abbé de Port-Royal, vol. iv.

HANDEL, Georg Friedrich, b. in Halle, Prussia, Feb. 24, 1684; d. in London, April 13, 1759; received his musical education in his native city, Berlin, and Hamburg; visited Italy 1706–09, and was chapel-master to the elector of Hanover 1709–12, but settled in the latter year in England, and soon became thoroughly nationalized. His Italian operas, of which he produced about fifty, are now forgotten, with the exception of some detached arias; but, under the influence of the strong religious feeling of the English people, he composed about twenty oratorios. — Ester (1720), Israel in Egypt (1738), Messiah (1741), Judas Macabaeus (1746), Jephthah (1751), and thereby exercised an influence on English taste and English art which is paralleled only by that of Shakespeare's dramas.

HANDICRAFTS AMONG THE HEBREWS. That the first craftsman mentioned in Scripture, Tubal-Cain (Gen. iv. 22), was a worker in metals, indicates that metal-working was one of the earliest crafts among the Hebrews; and the circumstance becomes so much the more significant, as the general Hebrew expression for a artisan (????) primitively denotes a worker in metals, or, at least, a worker in some hard material. All such kinds of labor as required less strength and skill, and administered only to the necessities of every-day life (baking, weaving, tailoring, house-building, etc.), were in the oldest time performed by the householder, the women, and the slaves, and continued to be performed in that way even after each kind had developed into a specific trade (1 Sam. ii. 19; 2 Sam. xiii. 8; Prov. xxxi. 22; Acts ix. 39). Corporations organized in the form of castes, or monopolies belonging exclusively to certain families, did not exist among the Hebrews; and when we hear of a certain place where artisans of the tribe of Judah were working, or of certain occupations, such as byblos, were inherited in certain families of the tribe of Judah, these are only insulared occurrences, probably incidental remembrances from the time the people lived in Egypt. Nevertheless, in the cities the members of the same trade generally lived together in the same neighborhood: there were in the confusion of the period of the Judges, and under the heavy pressure of enemies, who often carried away as prisoners of war the artisans, especially the metal-workers, in order to weaken the conquered people.

HAMMOND, Joseph, b. in the Barbadoes, 1793; d. in London, April 23, 1868. He was educated at Oriel College, Oxford; became fellow there with Keble and Newman; filled, in succession, the curacies of Newton, Faringdon, and Hackney; was tutor in Oriel 1828, and principal of St. Mary's Hall 1833. In 1832 he delivered the Bampton Lectures, choosing for his subject The Scholastic Philosophy considered in its Relation to Christian Theology (3d ed., 1848). These lectures exposed him to the charge of Arianism; but in spite of this he was chosen Regius Professor of Divinity in 1836. In 1848 he was promoted to the see of Hereford, and consecrated, in spite of the remonstrance of thirteen bishops. The question of the bishop's orthodoxy was the subject of a heated pamphlet discussion, for the literature of which see Allibone. Among Hampton's writings are Philosophical Eclaircissements sur la Religion de l'Antiquité (1827), Parochial Sermons (1836), Tryals of the Greek Philosophy (Edinburgh, 1862).
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Hands, laying on of. See Imposition of Hands.

Handing. See Punishments among the Hebrews.

Handnah (sweetness, a common female name among the Hebrews and Phoenicians, cf., in Virgil, Dido's sister Anna) was one of the wives of Elkanah of Ramathaim-Zophim (1 Sam. i.1, 2).

She was barren for many years; but, in answer to her earnest prayer, Jehovah sent her a son, whom she called Samuel (see art.). Her magnificent song of praise at his birth (1 Sam. ii. 1-10) is the prototype of the Magnificat, the song of Mary the mother of our Lord (Luke i.46-55).

Hanover. See Prussia.

Hansz, Markus, b. at Völkermarkt, in Carinthia, April 23, 1688; d. in Vienna, Sept. 5, 1708; was educated in the Jesuit college of Eberndorf; studied at the university of Vienna; and was for many years a teacher of philosophy in the Jesuit college of Graz. His ambition was to produce for Germany a Gallia Christiana, Anglica Sacra, or Italia Sacra; and in 1727 appeared the first volume of his Germania Sacra, devoted to the church of Spain, and the bishopric of Passau; in 1729 the second (Salzburg); and from 1731 to 1754 the third (Ratisbon). But the freedom with which he treated local legends (on St. Rupert and others) roused such an opposition to him, that he felt compelled to renounce literary work. The work was continued by Usermann and others, but was never completed.

Haphtaroth, plural Haphtarot, were reading-lessons or paragraphs taken from the prophets for use in the synagogues on the Sabbath and feast-days, in connection with sections from the law. Cf. Acts ii. 15; and Pericopes.

Har'ran (the Greek and Latin Carrha, Carch), a city and territory in Northern Mesopotamia, on the road from Ur of the Chaldees to Canaan. It was probably the fertility of the region which caused Terah and Nahor to stop there while Abraham and Lot pushed forwards to Canaan. To the Assyrians the place was of great importance as a military station when campaigns were made in Cilicia. Ezekiel (xxvii. 23) speaks of it as carrying on a considerable trade with Tyre. In Roman history it is famous as the scene of the defeat of Crassus and the assassination of Caracalla. It flourished also under the Arabs, but was never completed. — Haran (Greek, Ἀράω) is the name of the youngest son of Terah (Gen. xi. 26).

Harbaugh, Henry, D.D., a genial and scholarly divine of the German Reformed Church, and of Swiss descent; b. near Waynesborough, Penn., Oct. 28, 1817; d. in Mercersburg, Penn., Dec. 28, 1867. He worked on his father's farm till his nineteenth year, and then engaged in other employments until 1840, when he entered Franklin and Marshall College, Mercersburg, and, after spending three years there, was successively pastor of the Reformed Church, Lewisburg, Penn. (1849), Lancaster (1850), and Lebanon (1860). In 1803 he became the successor of Dr. Wolfe in the chair of theology at Mercersburg. Dr. Harbaugh was a prominent representative of the Mercersburg school of theology. He possessed poetical gifts; wrote poems in the so-called "Pennsylvania German," which appeared in the Guardian, and after his death in a volume under the title Harbaugh's Harfe (Philadelphia, 1870), which enjoyed a wide popularity. He also wrote some hymns, one of which, Jesus, I live to thee, has passed into hymnological collections. Of his larger works the more important are, Heaven, or the Sainted Dead, 1848-51, 3 vols. (Heavenly Home, Heavenly Recognition, Future Life); Life of Michael Schlatter (German), 1857; and Fathers of the Reformed Church in Europe and America, Lancaster, 1857, 2 vols. He was for seventeen years editor of the Guardian, and the last year of his life of the Mercersburg Review.

Harding, Stephen, English Cistercian monk; b. in Sherborne, Devonshire; abbot at Citeaux 1109; received Bernard there 1113; d. there March 28, 1134. See his life by Mr. Dalgairns, in the Lives of the English Saints; also Cistercians.

Hardwick, Charles, b. at Slingsby, Yorkshire, Sept. 22, 1821; d. Aug. 18, 1856, while ascending the Pyrenees, near Bagnères de Luchon. He was successively fellow of St. Catherine's Hall, Cambridge, professor of theology in Queen's College, Birmingham (1852), diocesan lecturer at Cambridge (1855), and archdeacon of Ely (1856). He is the author of several valuable works displaying thorough scholarship. These are, A History of the Articles of Religion, Camb., 1851, revised edition, 1859; A History of the Christian Church (2. Middle Ages; I. Reforming Movements), 2 vols., 2d ed., 1861-65, 3d ed., revised by W. Stubbs, Lond., 1872, 1875; and particularly
HARE, Julius Charles, one of the most influential of modern English theologians; b. Sept. 13, 1795, at Herstmonceux, Sussex, in the palsy of the Episcopal Church; d. there Jan. 23, 1855. He was educated at the Charter House school, with Grote and Thirlwall, the distinguished historians of Greece. A considerable portion of his youth was spent on the Continent. In 1811 he visited the Wartburg, Luther's Patmos, and there, as he was later to say, as if in a trance, was captured by the mark of Luther's ink upon the wall, and there took his first lesson in the art of throwing inkstands at the devil's head." In 1812 he entered Trinity College, Cambridge, and distinguished himself by thorough classical and general culture. In 1818 he was made fellow and tutor of Trinity, and gathered around him a number of admiring students, among them John Sterling, Archbishop Trench, and Frederick Maurice (subsequently his brother-in-law).

Hare's first introduction to the public was as joint translator, with Bishop Thirlwall, of Niebuhr's Roman history (1828). His love for German scholarship was intensified by his intimacy with Thomas Carlyle and with Bunsen, as also by his study of Coleridge's works, whom he profoundly esteemed as a Christian philosopher. In 1832 he went to the Continent, and spent several months in Rome. This visit forms an epoch in his life. Rome, the seat of archaeology, history, and art, had a powerful attraction for him; Rome, the centre of religious life and ecclesiastical institutions, repelled him, and confirmed him in his Protestant convictions, notwithstanding his romantic enthusiasm for the middle ages. In Rome he made the personal acquaintance of Dr. Bunsen, who was then ambassador of Prussia to the Vatican, afterwards to England.

On returning to England in 1834, he was made rector of Herstmonceux, and, later, archdeacon of Lewis in the diocese of Chichester, and chaplain to the Queen. In this village, not far from the southern coast of England, he labored until his death, surrounded by a large circle of friends, and held in universal esteem for his noble character and attainments. His last words were, "Upwards, upwards!" Archdeacon Hare combined thorough scholarship, original thought, noble character, harm- less wit, and manly piety. He was as familiar with Luther, Schleiermacher, Neander, Olshausen, Nitzsch, Tholuck, Lücke, etc., as with Cranmer, Hooker, Leighton, Pearson, and Tillotson. He collected one of the most valuable private libraries, of twelve thousand volumes, which completely occupied every wall in the house. He presented it to Trinity College in Cambridge. In the department of philosophy he was an independent disciple of Coleridge. In theology he had most sympathy with Dr. Arnold, but excelled him in the extent of his scholarship. He was one of the last of the heroes, a country parson, who kept his school, which seeks to liberalize the Anglican communion by keeping it in friendly intercourse with Continental thought and learning. He was a sturdy champion of Protestantism against the encroachments of Romanism and Tractarianism; but he never exposed himself to the charge of disloyalty to the Church, nor forgot the personal regard due to his opponents. He was especially pains at the transition of Archdeacon, now Cardinal, Manning, his former colleague and intimate friend, to Romanism.

As an author, Hare had some peculiarities of spelling (forst for forced, preacht for preached, etc.), and embodied the most valuable part of his works in notes, which occupy a much larger space than the text. His strength lay in his combination of theological attainments with purity of character, and in his talent for stimulating others to further study and investigation.

His ablest theological work is The Mission of the Comforter, with Notes, 3d ed., 1876 (re-published in Boston). It contains five sermons preached at Cambridge from the words of our Lord (John xvi. 7-11) on the office of the Holy
HARE.
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HARLEY, Francois de, b. in Paris, Aug. 14, 1625; d. at Conflans, Aug. 6, 1695; was made Archbishop of Rouen in 1651, and of Paris in 1670. He was unprincipled and intolerant; and his influence at the court he used against the Huguenots. He was one of the principal promoters of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. He edited the Synodicon Parisiense.

HARMER, Thomas, b. in Norwich, Eng., 1715; pastor of the Independent Church at Wattonfield, Suffolk, 1735; d. there Nov. 27, 1798. The work of his lifetime was Observations on Various Passages of Scripture, placing them in a new light, and ascertaining the meaning of several not determinable by the methods commonly made use of by the learned, compiled from relations incidentally mentioned in books of voyages and travels into the East, Lond., 1764, 2 vols., in 1787 2 additional vols., 4th ed. by Adam Clarke, LL.D., 1808, 4 vols., with large additions and a life of the author. Mr. Harmer also wrote Outlines of a New Commentary on the Book of Solomon's Song, London, 1708.

HARMONISTS. See Rapinists.

HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS. We shall consider in this article the relation of the Gospels to each other, both in point of form and their choice of matter, and whether it is possible to construct a harmony. At the very outset the striking difference between the Gospel of John and the other three Gospels must be noticed, both in respect to the choice of matter (John alone relating the visits of Jesus to the feasts in Jerusalem, and, on the other hand, describing few of the events which happened in Galilee) and in respect to the kind of matter; the discourses of our Lord which John gives having a peculiarly elevated character as compared with those of the other three Gospels. The first three or synoptic Gospels likewise often differ. Mark gives hardly any of our Lord's discourses, and contains an exceedingly small amount of matter not found in Matthew and Luke; while these two Gospels, when compared, are found to have much which is peculiar to each. Matthew gives sixteen miracles, Luke fifteen (eleven being common), and Mark fifteen, twelve of which are found in Matthew, and ten in Luke. Then, again, the congregation of the same discourses and events is different in the three synoptists; and while the descriptions of the same events often present remarkable agreements in language, even to striking and unusual words, they also present disagreements, not only in the language, but also in the matter, so as to sometimes even give the appearance of contradictory statements.

1. Choice and Arrangement of the Matter in the Synoptists.—Even if we had no patristic accounts of their origin, the study of the Gospels would convince us that their authors had not the least intention of giving a complete daily journal of the life of Christ. Of the first half of his public activity they confined themselves to only a few fragments, and by their own confession they passed over a great deal. Thus it appears from Matt. xi. 21 sqq. that Jesus performed many miracles in Chorazin; but the synoptists do not give a single detail of his activity there. Even the Introduction to Luke's Gospel disavows his Intiate with this statement; for he might well call his work "systematic and complete" in compari-
son with the sporadic attempts of other Christians, without its being arranged like a journal, but only giving that which was essential and important in systematic arrangement. But each synoptist had a plan of his own. Matthew wrote for Jews, and sought to prove that Jesus fulfilled the Messianic prophecies concerning the seed of Abraham (Matt. i. 1). Luke, who belonged to the Pauline circle, relates, for the most part, those events in the life of our Lord, and those discourses, which go to confirm the principle that all mankind, so far as it thirsts after salvation, shall participate in the benefits of it. For this reason he presents Christ as the second Adam (comp. Luke iii. 23-28). Mark, on the other hand, as John the Presbyter (Euseb., iii. 39) long ago said, follows no particular plan, but wrote down from memory what Peter related to him from time to time. None of the synoptists, then, follow a chronological arrangement. Luke arranges his Gospel according to the matter (x. 25-xiii., discourses; xiv.-xvi., parables; etc.); and so does Matthew (iii.-iv., the beginning of his activity; v.-vii., laws of the kingdom; viii.-ix., miracles; ix. 38-xi., the disciples; xiii., xiv., parables; etc.). Notwithstanding this general principle, however, they do often relate events in the order of their occurrence (comp. Matt. ix. 27, 32; xii. 1, etc.; Mark i. 29, etc.; Luke iv. 38, etc.). The investigation of the extent of the agreements of the synoptists in these cases is one of the tasks of the harmonists. Such labors were carried on from early times, at first with the purpose of forming a complete narrative of all the events and discourses of our Lord. (See DIATESSARON.) In modern times they have been conducted for the purpose of constructing a chronology of Christ's life. Prominent amongst the workers in this department [see below] are Gerson (d. 1429), Calvin (d. 1564), Andreas Osiander (d. 1552), Chemnitz (d. 1588), and Bengel (d. 1751). Osiander (Harmonia Evangeliorum, Basel, 1557) is the first to mention the possibility for the curious circumstance, that, starting from the most irrational theory of inspiration, he adopted the principle that the evangelists, in order not to write that which was false, dared not depart from the chronological arrangement. To carry the principle out, he was obliged often to suppose that the very same event, occurring under the very same circumstances, was repeated two or three times. Peter's wife's mother, for example, was healed three times! Gerson (Concordia evangelistarum sive monostessaron, Col. c. 1471) proceeds on the theory that the synoptists did not intend to follow a chronological order; and so Calvin (Harmonia evangelistarum tribus compotita, Geneva, 1553), and especially Chemnitz (Harmoniae evangelicæ, Frankfurt, 1593 sqq.), who makes such events and discourses to follow each other which are definitely placed in chronological order by the evangelists. It is as clear as sunlight that every healthy attempt in the direction of a harmony must proceed upon this principle. Bengel (Richtige Auffassung der Evang., Tübingen, 1730) marks no progress; but he rightly recognized that Luke did not mean to follow a chronological order, but the writer of this article, in his Kritik d. evang. Geschichte, returned to the principles of Chemnitz, and believes he has proved that the sequence of events, therefore, is decisive. But even such a statement contradicts that of another, and that their statements enable us to restore a chronological harmony of the larger part of Christ's public career. The following case, which we choose because it is the most difficult and complicated, will serve as an illustration of our method. In Matt. ix. it is related, that, as Jesus on a certain day sat at meat, the Pharisees asked him why he did not fast. The exact day is not given; but it is definitely stated in ix. 18 that Jairus came to him "while he spake these things;" and in ix. 27, that, as "Jesus passed by from thence," two blind men followed him; and in ix. 32, that, "as they went forth," a dumb man was brought to him. Here the sequence of four events is given. The preceding section definitely gives the sequence of four other events (viii.-ix. 9),—the stilling of the tempest (viii. 23), the healing of the Gadarene (viii. 29), the cure of the paralytic (ix. 1), and the call of Matthew (ix. 9). Again we have the following sequence: the healing of the blind and dumb man (xii. 22), the charge of collusion with Beelzebub (xii. 38), the announcement of his mother and brethren (xii. 46); and on the same day that these things occurred he spake many parables (xii. 1). Mark, however, in the most emphatic way says that Jesus spake these parables at the seaside (iv. 1), on the same day stilled the tempest (iv. 35), then healed the Gadarene (v. 1), and, after his return to the western shore, met Jairus (v. 22). Thus the conclusion is forced upon us by Mark that the three groups of events which Matthew places in sections, where they properly belong in point of matter, belong together in point of time. While Jesus was staying at Capernaum, the blind and deaf man is brought, whose cure affords the occasion for the charge of collusion with Beelzebub. During the conversation the Pharisees demand a sign; and, while Jesus is replying, his mother arrives. Towards evening Jesus utters the parables on the seaside; then follows the stilling of the tempest. The following morning the Gadarene was healed. After his return, the question concerning fasting was put; and at the same hour Jairus came. As he left his house, the dumb man is brought, and (perhaps a day or two afterwards) the paralytic is healed. Mark got the events from Peter, an eye-witness of them, and had the sequence impressed upon his memory; but Matthew, who was called after their occurrences, heard them from several of the disciples; and he remembered most distinctly that the healing of Jairus' daughter was a special topic of conversation: hence he put it down immediately after the account of his call.

This example is a crucial test of the Chemnitzian view of the Evangelists. It is as clear as sunlight that the Evangelists have the same sayings at different times. Matthew has given us an unmistakable illustration of this (vii. 17, xii. 33). He even repeats the same events in his Chronica, and relates them in detail (Luke xiii. 12 sqq.; Matt. xxv. 14 sqq.).

2. The Language. — The synoptists in their
accounts of the same events often fully agree in the language, and again differ widely in this regard (comp. Matt. ix. 15, Mark ii. 20, Luke v. 35). But the points of agreement are far more numerous than the points of disagreement. According to Norton, one-sixth of Matthew's Gospel is in verbal agreement with the other synoptists, and seven-eighths of this are from discourses; one-sixth of Mark's Gospel agrees with the other synoptists, and nearly four-fifths of this are from the discourses; Luke only agrees to the extent of one-tenth with Matthew and Mark, but more than nineteen-twentieths of it is from the discourses.

Various theories have been suggested to account for these agreements and disagreements in language, and they are as follows. (1) A primal or germ gospel (Urevanglirium) from which the evangelists drew. It has been defined as an Aramaic Matthew (Corrodi, Schmidt), a "Hebrew Gospel" (Lessing, Niemeyer, Weber), or a record composed by a company of apostles (Eichhorn, Marsh); but all these various forms have been outlawed. Holtzmann has advocated the hypothesis of a primal Mark and an original collection of discourses by Matthew; but that the kerygma (discourses), which Papias attributes to Matthew, included other matter, even Strauss granted. (2) The theory that one evangelist used the other, there being one original one. But it is comical to observe that each of the possible combinations has its zealous defenders. But why should men who had the best opportunities of getting details from the very eye-witnesses of Christ use each other's works? The theory, on the other hand, begets many difficulties, as, for example, Why did the evangelist who used his predecessor omit so much of his matter, alter the language of the Lord's discourses (often quoting half a verse word for word, and then suddenly breaking off), and alter the chronological sequences? (3) The evangelists drew from a common tradition. This is the theory of Giselaer (Hist. krist. Versuch u. d. Entstehung d. schriftl. Evangelien, Leipzig, 1818), and the only tenable one. In the repeated narration of the events of Christ's life, certain points were always emphasized, and these the evangelists have in common; the very expressions being impressed upon the memories of the hearers. But the individuality of the writers also asserted itself.

3. John's Gospel (see John, Gospel of) was written (96) at a time when the altered circumstances of the Church, and the first indications of Gnosticism, made a new point of view necessary. For this reason he supplemented the accounts of the synoptists both in respect to the outward details of Christ's life and his personality (in opposition to the false Gnosis). This Gospel differs largely from the others, but not to the prejudice of the harmony. The more elevated style of the Lord's discourses which it records has furnished a difficulty to some; but as the complete with a moral, the "flame of joy and brilliancy" (as De Wette himself acknowledges), as it is improbable that the disciple should have surpassed the Master, and as the synoptists here and there rise to the same strain (Matt. xi. 25–30, xiii. 16, 17, etc.; Luke x. 21–23), the difficulty completely disappears for those who have an ear for the light-born excellence of Christ's words. The only real difficulty which John's Gospel offers to the harmonist is the date of the Last Supper. The discussion over this extremely complicated and prickly question is not yet closed. The apparent contradictions in the accounts of the resurrection are easily solved; John narrating what Mary Magdalene saw, the synoptists combining in one account her experiences and those of the other women. Mark indicates a difference between the two (xvi. 8, 9).

EBRARD.

[Continuous narratives of the life of Christ, combining details of all the evangelists, are called in another and special sense Harmonies. The Diatessaron of Tatian, the "quiueia" of Ammonius, the German Heiland, and Otfried's Harmony, are the most important examples of these. For accounts of them see Diatessaron, Ammonius, Heiland, etc. Harmonies in addition to those mentioned in the body of the article have been published by Stephens (Paris, 1653), G. Calixtus (Halle, 1624), T. Cartwright (Amst., 1627, 1647), Lightfoot (Lond., 1644, and in English, Lond., 1655), Clericus (Amst., 1669), Macknight (Lond., 1756, and often), J. Priestley (in English, Lond., 1777), Newcome (Dublin, 1775, ed. by Dr. Robinson, Andover, 1814, 1844), Townsend (Lond., 1855, Bost., 1837), Robinson (Bost., 1845, revised ed., 1851, and often), Stroud (Lond., 1853), Strong (N.Y., 1854), Greswell (Oxon., 5th ed., 1850), Gardiner (Andover, 1850); Harmonies of the Synoptists by Planck (Gotting, 1809), De Wette and Liicke (Berol., 1818, 1842), Rediger (Halle, 1829, 1839), Anger (Leip., 1852). For more complete list, see Robinson's and Gardiner's Harmonies; and for general literature on the subjects treated in the article, see Gospels; also Schaff's Church History, revised ed., 1882, vol. 1. pp. 575–597.]

Harms, Claus, a powerful champion of the religion of faith in a rationalistic age: b. at Fahrstedt, Schleswig-Holstein, May 25, 1778: d. in Kiel, Feb. 1, 1855. Prevented, at first, by lack of means from securing a higher education, he labored in his father's mill until he was nineteen. After his father's death he entered a classical school, and subsequently passed into the university of Kiel. The teaching at the university was predominantly rationalist; but, influenced thereto largely by the perusal of Schleiermacher's Discourses on Religion, Harms turned away from rationalism as vanity, and gave himself up to faith in Christ as the only hope of the sinner. In 1806 he became assistant pastor in Lunden, and in 1816 was transferred to Kiel, where he remained during the rest of his life, in spite of calls, as Schleiermacher's successor, to Trinity Church, Berlin, in 1834, and to other places. He was obliged in 1849 to give up his positions on account of blindness. In 1878 the hundredth anniversary of his birth was celebrated in Kiel, and a tablet placed on the house which he had occupied.

Harms exercised a very decided influence upon the religious faith of his day, and his life was peculiarly an occasion of rationalism. As a preacher he was much sought after, the university students flocking to hear him. After Twesten's advent in Kiel as professor, it was said, "Twesten converts his hearers, and Harms baptizes them. He was a man of the people, and his style was no less popular than it was fresh and trenchant. In 1817, at
the three hundredth anniversary of the Reformation, Harms took occasion to speak out his mind against rationalism, and did it by publishing, side by side with Luther's theses, ninety-five of his own. He utters bold words against reason, which he calls the "pope of our time," and the religion of reason, which has "run mad in the Lutheran Church, disowns Christ from the altar, throws God's Word from the pulpit, creates God, whereas God used to be regarded as having created man," etc. These theses went through Germany like a tempest. Rationalists rallied against the author; and, as Von Ammon has said, they were indeed a bitter medicine for the then prevailing weakness of faith. They went, however, with his writings in their defence, with healing and converting power to homes throughout the entire land. Harms also wrote hymns, some of which have passed into German hymn-books.

Lit. Among his volumes of sermons are Winterpostille, 1808; Sommernpost., 1811, 8th ed. of both, Leipzig, 1816; Neue Winterpost., 1824; Neue Sommernpost., 1827; D. heil. Passion, 1857; D. Vater Unser, 1838; Bergpredigt, 1841; D. Bibel., 1842; D. Offenb. Johannis, 1844; Tröstpredigten, 1852. He also wrote a Life of Heinrich von ähnlich den Blutstätten für unser Gläube (1817), in Low-German, and Pastoraltheologie (Kiel, 1830, 3d ed., 1878), a book which ought to be on every pastor's table. See Autobiography, 2d ed., Kiel, 1852; Dr. M. Baumgarten: Ein Denkmal f. C. Harms, Braunsch., 1855 [and memorials by G. Bachmann, Lüneburg, 1878; N. Kiehlitz, Kiel, 1878, and the volume Die Gedächtnisfeier für Claus Harms an seinem hundertsten Geburtstag, Kiel, 1878].

HARMES, Georg Ludwig Detlev Theodor (commonly known as LUDWIG HARMES), a most original and successful German Lutheran pastor; b. May 5, 1806, in Walsrode, Luneburg; d. at Hermannsburg, Nov. 14, 1865. After studying at the university of Göttingen, and spending several years as private tutor, he became in 1844 his father's assistant as pastor of the church at Her- mannburg, a town of thirty-five hundred inhabitants, near Hanover. His father belonged to the rationalistic school, but was a man of strong and robust character. Ludwig, on the other hand, had undergone a thorough conversion at the university. He labored at Hermannsburg as few have done, not only in the pulpit, the services filling up the entire Sabbath, but as a pastor among the people. His popular and winning manners, his sympathy with the poor and the sorrowing, secured for him the love of all. On Sunday afternoons he held a catechetical class, which lasted three hours, and was attended by a thousand people. These labors led to a religious awakening such as North Germany had never witnessed before. Harms's chief source of power was his sermons. He understood as few, if any, since Luther have understood, how to preach to the people. His mind was, before everything else, popular. His sermons were simple, picturesquely expressed in terse language and concretely. He followed out the advice which he gave to a brother minister in these words: "Call every thing by its right name, so that others may grasp with their minds what you mean, and present truth as concretely as possible, so that it may not pass away over people's heads." [Professor Park, in a very interesting article in The Congregationalist (Feb. 23, 1866), says in this connection, "He preferred the concrete to the abstract, did not speak of holiness so often as of God, nor of sin so often as the devil. He was terrific in his denunciations of popular sins, and exhibited the tenderest concern for his people," etc.] Harms drew his sermons from every-day life, and preached to life. The interest of his immediate hearers, the Luneburg peasants, was to him matter of supreme concern. He spoke their dialect. His themes were the necessity of a thorough conversion, justification by faith, and the evidence of faith in a consistent life. He denounced sin unsparingly, so that there was no back-door left for the sinner, and in vivid reality painted the condemnation of the ungodly and the blessedness of the believer. He dealt not in general delineations and exhortations, but pictured before his hearers each specific step and duty.

But in the mere gifts of body Harms was sadly lacking. His voice was shrill, his manner in the pulpit somewhat stiff; and his bodily strength, which was never great, in his last years seemed hardly sufficient to carry him through a sermon. But with all these defects he riveted the attention of his hearers, and gave the impression of absolute sincerity.

Under these labors the life of the community underwent a radical change. Sunday was strictly observed, and many were regularly maintained. Swearing and excessive drinking were given up. No beggar was known in the place; and the yearly contributions of the church to benevolent objects were very large, amounting in 1854 to twenty-four thousand marks for missions alone. [Professor Park relates the following incident: "I met a carpenter going to his day-labor. 'How do you do?' I asked. 'I cannot but be well,' he replied, 'having so many religious privileges as I enjoy here,' etc.]

But these were not the extent of Harms's enterprises. After his return from Africa (in 1849), he organized a seminary for the training of missionaries, and was led to it by the frequent applications by young people who wished to become missionaries. This institution was very successful, and, besides sending out missionaries to different parts of the world, colonized the town of Hermannsburg in Africa. The funds for erecting the buildings, as well as the funds for other enterprises, were regarded by Harms as direct answers to prayer. In 1854 he established a missionary journal, which became very popular in Germany. As characteristic of his independence, Professor Park relates the following incident: "On one occasion, when Harms was in Hannover, the king despatched one of his officers with the state carriage to bring him to the palace. 'Give my regards to the king,' said Harms, and say that I would obey his order if my duty allowed; but I must go home ((1211allendlo my parish.'"

Harms published a number of volumes of sermons, which are among the most widely circulated in Germany. Among these are Evangeliumpredigten, Hermannsburg, 8th ed., 1877; Epistelpredigten, 2d ed., 1872; Auseg., d. Psalmen, 2d ed., 1870. See his Life by his brother, THEODOR HARMES.
HARP. See Music Among the Hebrews.

HARRIS, Howel, a Welsh revivalist; b. at Tremecca, 1714; d. there July 21, 1778. He was "the first lay preacher in the great Methodist movement,"—a year and a half ahead of Whitefield and Wesley. He had to encounter great opposition, but persevered. With the Wesleys he held life-long intimacy. He was a layman, and all his repeated efforts to obtain ordination were vain. His success in preaching was wonderful. See Tyerman's Wesley.

HARRIS, John, independent minister; b. at Ugborough, Devonshire, March 8, 1602; became principal and professor of theology, New College, Cheshunt, 1850; d. there Dec 21, 1858. He was the author of the widely circulated and able prize soldier; but after his conversion (in 1758) he devoted more and more time and strength to religious duties, until in 1769 he was ordained, and then left all secular occupations. In 1774 the General Association of Separate Baptists chose him "apostle," and ordained him by the laying-on of the hands of every minister in that body. He was much persecuted.

HARRIS, Samuel, the "Apostle of Virginia;" b. in Hanover County, Jan. 12, 1724; date of his death is uncertain. "For many years he was a soldier; but after his conversion (in 1758) he devoted more and more time and strength to religious duties, until in 1769 he was ordained, and then left all secular occupations. In 1774 the General Association of Separate Baptists chose him "apostle," and ordained him by the laying-on of the hands of every minister in that body. He was much persecuted. See Harvard University.

HARRIS, John. See Harvard University.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY. 1. Constitution.—At present Harvard University comprehends the following departments: Harvard College, the Divinity School, the Law School, the Medical School, the Dental School, the Lawrence Scientific School, the Museum of Comparative Zoology, the Bussey Institution (a school of agriculture), the College Library, and the Astronomical Observatory. The Peabody Museum of American Archeology and Ethnology is a constituent part of the university, where the internal affairs (discipline, studies, degrees) are administered by the faculty of the department (consisting of all its instructors, at whose head is a dean, or director). The control of general university matters, particularly of the degrees of master of arts and doctor of philosophy, is in the hands of the Academic Council, composed of all the professors and assistant professors of the university. The only honorary degrees conferred are doctor of divinity, and doctor of laws. The conferring power in all cases is the corporation, with the consent of the overseers, Officers of instruction are of various classes,—professors, appointed by corporation and overseers, for life; assistant professors, instructors, tutors, appointed for definite periods; instructors and lecturers, appointed annually; and demonstrators and assistants, appointed by the corporation for various terms. During the two first periods of existence—the colonial (1636-92) and the provincial (1692-1780)—the college was under the control of the State, and so remained to some extent after the Revolution, up to 1865, when the last bonds of union were severed; and the university is now absolutely independent of all parts. Among the eminent men who have been instructors in Harvard may be mentioned John Winthrop, John Quincy Adams, Henry Ware, Andrews Norton, J. G. Palfrey, James Walker, E. T. Channing, Jared Sparks, Joseph Story, Simon Greenleaf, Theophilus Parsons, Edward Everett, George Ticknor, H. W. Longfellow, James Russell Lowell, Benjamin Peirce, Jacob Bigelow, J. T. Cogswell, Louis Agassiz, Jeffries Wyman, Asa Gray, John C. Warren, James Jackson, Benjamin Waterhouse, C. C. Felton, and W. C. Bond.

2. Instruction.—Beginning as a seminary for men of letters in 1636, Harvard has become a university, in which all branches of science are represented, and the libertas docendi exists in its fullest extent. During its first century the instruction was given by the president and several tutors. The first professor
ship (one of divinity) was established by Thomas Hollis, an English Baptist layman, in 1721, who also endowed the second chair (of mathematics and natural philosophy) in 1726; and in 1764 was created the first professorship endowed by a native New-Englander— that of Hebrew and other Oriental languages, by Thomas Hancock. The college now advanced rapidly to university proportions. The Medical School was begun in 1785, the Botanic Garden in 1805, the Divinity School in 1815, the Law School in 1817, the Astronomical Observatory in 1846, the Agassiz Museum of Comparative Zoology in 1856, the Peabody Museum in 1866, the Dental School in 1868, and the Bussey Institution in 1871 (to which was added in 1872 the Arnold Arboretum, for the open-air culture of trees, shrubs, and herbaceous plants). During the past thirteen years (administration of President C. W. Eliot) there has been a marked expansion in the instruction, both in the teaching force and in the general apparatus (buildings, etc.). The course for the degree of bachelor of arts extends over four years, in the first of which the student has specified courses and requirement; in the others, elective. In the three upper classes (in which about a hundred and seventy courses are offered by over fifty instructors) the student may select for his degree any studies in which the class-instruction amounts on an average to not less than twelve hours a week. The elective system, with its specializing tendencies, has grown steadily in favor; and prescribed studies seem likely soon to disappear altogether. Here, as in the discipline, the theory of the college is that the largest possible liberty is to be given to the student, and the appeal made to his sense of responsibility. In the professional schools the courses for degrees are fixed. In all departments, except the Medical School, special students not candidates for degrees are admitted without examination, may take such studies as they choose, receive certificates for what work they do, and are subject to the same regulations as regular students.

3. Religious Character.—The university is now wholly unsectarian. Sectarian control of its general government had practically ceased by the middle of the last century. In the movement which divided the Congregationalists of Massachusetts, inclining to the government of the present century may be said of the department of philosophy (Professor C. W. Eliot) there has been a marked expansion in the instruction, both in the teaching force and in the general apparatus (buildings, etc.). The course for the degree of bachelor of arts extends over four years, in the first of which the student has specified courses and requirement; in the others, elective. In the three upper classes (in which about a hundred and seventy courses are offered by over fifty instructors) the student may select for his degree any studies in which the class-instruction amounts on an average to not less than twelve hours a week. The elective system, with its specializing tendencies, has grown steadily in favor; and prescribed studies seem likely soon to disappear altogether. Here, as in the discipline, the theory of the college is that the largest possible liberty is to be given to the student, and the appeal made to his sense of responsibility. In the professional schools the courses for degrees are fixed. In all departments, except the Medical School, special students not candidates for degrees are admitted without examination, may take such studies as they choose, receive certificates for what work they do, and are subject to the same regulations as regular students.

4. Funds and Collections.—The invested funds of the university amount to about four million dollars, and the property in lands, houses, etc., not paying interest, to about two million. The number of books in all the libraries of the university is over two hundred and fifty thousand, and there is about an equal number of pamphlets. The Museum of Comparative Zoology is reckoned among the greatest natural-history collections of the world: it is especially rich in insects. The botanical collection ranks high in some departments, especially the composite. The Museum of American Archeology, though young, has a respectable collection of the present century, and other departments are similarly well represented. The number of instructors in the university is over a hundred and fifty; the number of students, over thirteen hundred and fifty.

HARVEST AMONG THE HEBREWS. The season of gathering grain or fruits generally commenced about the middle of April (John iv. 35). In some parts, as in Jericho, it commenced a little earlier. On the second day of the Passover feast (i.e., on the sixteenth day of the first month, Abid, or Nisan) a sheaf of the first-fruits was brought unto the priest (Lev. xxiii. 10); and thus the harvest season was inaugurated. The beginning was made with barley and with the Passover festival (Lev. xxiii. 9—14; 2 Sam. xxi. 9; Ruth i. 22); and with the wheat and the Feast of Ingathering (Exod. xxii. 16, xxiv. 22) it was concluded. The reapers were mostly hired men, over whom a servant was set (Ruth ii. 5). The maidens generally put the sheaves in bundles; but the
owner, together with his children, assisted the reapers, especially in carrying away the sheaves (Gen. xxxvii. 7). The passers-by saluted the reapers (Ruth ii. 4). Refreshments, especially drink, were provided for the reapers (Ruth ii. 9). The reapers were a season of great joy, especially when the crops had been plentiful (Isa. ix. 3; Ps. cxxvi. 6). The corners of the field were not reapèd, but left to the poor; and so also any sheaf that was forgotten in the field belonged to the poor and the stranger (Lev. xix. 9, xxiii. 22; Deut. xxiv. 19).

HASENKAMP. The name of three brothers, who, belonging to the same circle as Lavater, Jung-Stillig, Tersteegen, and Kolenbusch, spoke with great energy and impressiveness for the idea of a divine revelation, and against the flat rationalism prevailing in Germany during the latter half of the eighteenth century. — Johann Gerhard, b. July 12, 1736; d. June 10, 1777; was appointed rector at Duisburg in 1766, but was several times, both before and after his appointment, forbidden to preach on account of the mental excitement under which he suffered. His Life, begun by himself and finished by his son, is an interesting and instructive book, and gives the list of his works, mostly of a polemical and apologetical description. — Friedrich Arnold, b. Jan. 11, 1747; d. 1795; succeeded his brother as rector of Duisburg, and wrote Ueber die verdunkelten Aufklärung, 1789, Briefe über wichtige Wahrheiten der Religion, 1794, 2 vols., etc.— Johann Heinrich, b. Sept. 10, 1750; d. June 17, 1814; was pastor of Dahle, near Altona, from 1779. His Christl. Schriften, 3 vols., were published after his death by his nephew.

HASSE, Friedrich Rudolf, b. at Dresden, June 29, 1808; d. at Bonn, Oct. 14, 1862. He studied at Leipzig and Berlin; was successively privat-docent at the latter university (1834), professor extraordinary of church history at Grieswald (1839) and then at Bonn (1841), and professor ordinary (1848). His fame rests upon his masterpiece, Anselm von Canterbury, Leipzig, 1848, 1850, 2 vols. He began his studies upon Anselm as early as 1832, when he chose him as the subject of his dissertation. Up to that time the scholastic period of church history had been very little studied. Hasse developed extraordinary gifts in exploring it. His dissertation was upon the Anselmic conception of the divine image, and proved the presence of a master historian. This impression was confirmed by his lectures on church history. In Bonn he completed (1843) the first volume of his monograph upon Anselm of Canterbury, containing the life. This was the fruit of the most thorough work and answers every demand of a monograph; for Anselm stands forth in all his individuality, and at the same time in his relation to the movements of his age. In 1853 Hasse issued his second volume, the theology of Anselm, presented in a form at once complete, objective, and clear. One is able to follow the development of the theology step by step to its rounded whole.

Hasse possessed great ability as a teacher, and was held in high esteem for his solidity of character, his childlike piety, and his great modesty, which led him not only to think little of himself, but to rejoice in the success of others. He took an intelligent interest in church matters, and especially in foreign missions. Besides his masterpiece, Anselm von Canterbury, he is the author of two posthumous volumes of lectures, Geschichte des alten Bundes, Leipzig, 1863, and Kirchengeschichte, Leipzig, 1864, 3 vols., 2d ed., 1872. See W. KRAFFT: Dr. F. R. Hasse, eine Lebensskizze, Bonn, 1885.

HATTEMISTS, a Dutch sect founded by Potianus van Hattem, who was pastor in Zealand, but was deposed in 1583. He was a disciple of Spinoza; and his doctrines rest on a mystical pantheism, in which the moral distinction between good and bad disappears. The sect was never of great consequence, and soon vanished.

HATTO, Bishop of Basel; b. in 763; was educated in the monastery of Reichenau; became director of its school, and abbot, 806; was made Bishop of Basel in 807, by Charlemagne, and in 811 sent as ambassador to the Emperor Nicephorus; resigned his position as abbot and bishop in 823, and died as simple monk in Reichenau 836.

Two works by him have come down to us,—Visio Wettini, a description of a walk through heaven, hell, and purgatory, which made a deep impression on his contemporaries, and was put into Latin verses by Walafrid Strabo; and Capitulare Hattonis, twenty-five statutes which he issued as bishop. Both works are found in Migne: Patr. Lat., vol. 105.

WAGENMANN.

HAUG, Martin, famous Orientalist; b. at Ostedorf in Württemberg, Jan. 30, 1827; d. at Ragatz, Switzerland, June 3, 1876. He studied at Tübingen, Göttingen, and Bonn, for three years (1858–59); assisted Bunsen on his Bibelwerk; was professor of Sanscrit in Poona college (1859–63); made a successful journey under British appointment through the province of Guzerat, for the purpose of collecting manuscripts of Zend and Sanscrit; returned to Germany in 1866; and from 1868 till his death he was professor of Sanscrit and comparative grammar at the university of Munich. His large collection of Zend, Behivei, Sanscrit, and Persian manuscripts, was pur-
HAVERNICK, Heinrich Andreas Christoph, b. at Kroplin, Mecklenburg, Germany, 1805; d. at Neu-Strelitz, 1849; a learned member of the Royal Library at Munich. His best known work is Essays on the Sacred Language of the Parsees, Bombay, 1862, 2d ed., revised and enlarged, London, 1878.

He left, Hans Nielsen, a powerful lay preacher and revivalist in Norway; was b. on the Haugen farm, in the county of Smalene, April 3, 1771; and d. on the Bredtvedt farm, in Aker County, March 29, 1824. He received only the common peasant education, but he was from early youth a zealous student of the Bible. In 1798 he began his missionary work, walking from place to place, and often preaching twice or thrice a day. He made a deep impression; but as he spoke rather aloof until finally the rationalistic clergy, and in 1804 he was arrested. He was kept in prison till 1811; and in 1814 he was finally sentenced to two years' hard labor for having held conventicles, and spoken disrespectfully of the Established Church. His followers, very numerous, spread over the whole country, and known under the name of "Haugians," or "Readers," did not separate from the State Church; they simply kept aloof until finally rationalistic ice itself began to thaw. See A. Chr. Bang: Hans Nielsen Hauge, Christiania, 1875.

HÁURAN. See BASHAN.

HAUSMANN, Nicolaus, one of Luther's dearest friends; b. at Freiburg, 1479; d. there 1538. He introduced the Reformation into Zwickau (1521), and subsequently into the duchy of Anhalt (1532). Luther heard of his death on Nov. 6, 1538, and lamented him greatly. He praised him for his exemplary piety, which did so much to commend the Reformation. "What we teach, he lives," he said of him. See O. G. Schmidt: Nicolaus Haumann, der Frend Luthers, Leipzig, 1860.

HAVELOCK, Henry, Sir, a distinguished English general and Christian layman; b. April 5, 1795, at Bishop-Wearmouth, Sunderland, where his father was a rich ship-builder; d. Nov. 25, 1857, at Neu-Strelitz, 1846; a learned member of the Royal Library at Munich. His best known work is Memoirs of Sir Henry Havelock, London, 1868.

HAVEN, Erastus Otis, D.D., LL.D., Methodist-Episcopal bishop; b. at Boston, Mass., Nov. 1, 1820; d. at Salem, Oregon, Tuesday, Aug. 2, 1881. He was graduated at the Wesleyan University 1842; took up the profession of teaching; was ordained 1848, and, after holding various positions, was professor in the University of Michigan 1853-56; editor of Zion's Herald, Boston, 1856-63; president of the University of Michigan 1863-69, of the North-Western University, Evanston, Ill., 1869-72; corresponding secretary of the board of education of the Methodist-Episcopal Church 1872-74; chancellor of the Syracuse University 1874; elected bishop 1880. His best known publication is Rhetoric for Schools, Colleges, and Private Study, New York, 1860.

HAVEN, Gilbert, D.D., Methodist-Episcopal bishop; b. near Boston, Sept. 19, 1821; d. at Malden, Mass., Jan. 8, 1880. After graduation at the Wesleyan University (1846), he taught for several years. In 1851 he joined the New-England Conference of the Methodist-Episcopal Church. In 1851 he was appointed chaplain of the Eighth Massachusetts Regiment, the first commissioned chaplain after the breaking-out of hostilities; but he only was one year in service. He was editor of Zion's Herald 1867-72, when he was elected bishop. He was a vigorous advocate of the cause of the colored people, and also of Protestantism. He was quite an extensive traveler; and his journey to Mexico he recorded in an interesting volume, Our Next-Door Neighbor; recent Sketches of Mexico, New York, 1874. See Havergal, Frances Ridley, a beloved and gifted religious writer; b. at Astley, Worcestershire, Eng., Dec. 14, 1836; d. at Caswell Bay, Swansea, South Wales, June 8, 1879. She was the daughter of a clergyman of the Church of England, and was carefully educated. Her own love of study led her to take up unusual lines; and she acquired some acquaintance with Greek and Hebrew, in order that she might read the Bible in the original. She was a devoted Christian woman, neglecting no opportunity to speak for the Saviour. She issued many volumes of prose and poetry, which have been blessed to many hearts. Of these perhaps the best known are the three collections of her poetry under the titles, Ministry of Song, Under the Surface, and Under His Shadow; and in prose Morning Belts and Little Pillows (devotions for children, published 1874), My King (1877),kept for the Master's Use (1879), and Swiss Letters (1882). See her interesting Memorials, by her sister, London and New York, 1880.

HAVERNICK, Heinrich Andreas Christoph, b. at Kroplin, Mecklenburg, Germany, 1805; d. at Neu-Strelitz, 1849; a learned member of the
HAVILAH. See Eden.

HAWAIIAN ISLANDS. See Sandwich Islands.

HAWES, Joel, D.D., b. Medway, Mass., Dec. 22, 1759; d. at Gilead, Conn., June 5, 1857. He was graduated from Brown University 1813; studied at Andover; and from 1818 till his death was pastor of the First Congregational Church in Hartford, Conn. He wrote several religious works, of which the best known is Lectures to Young Men on the Formation of Character, Hartford, 1828; repeatedly reprinted, and widely circulated, in the United States and Great Britain.


HAWKER, Robert Stephen, the grandson of this reverend man, was a scholar of Hengstenberg, and author of commentaries upon Daniel (Hamb., 1832) and upon Ezekiel (Erlangen, 1841), Handbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Alte Testament (Erlangen, Part I, 1842—43; Parts II and III, 1853—54; Part III, edited by Keil, 1849, English translation), A Historico-Critical Introduction to the Pentateuch (Edinburgh, 1850), and A General Historico-Critical Introduction to the Old Testament (1852).

HAYDEN, Joseph, b. at Rohran, on the frontier between Austria and Hungary, March 31, 1732; d. in Vienna, May 31, 1809; received his musical education at Hamburgh and Vienna. He was graduated at Yale College (1749), and conducted missions among the Mohawk, Oneida, Tuscarora, and Iroquois. He had great influence among these tribes.

HAYMON. See HAIMO.

HAZ'AEL(חָזֵא, הָזֵא, "God has seen"), king, for at least forty-five years, of Damascene Syria in the first half of the ninth century B.C. Sent by King Benhadad to consult Elisha concerning his cure from sickness, he received the announcement from the prophet of the king's death, and his own elevation to the throne. The day after his return, Benhadad died a violent death (perhaps drowned in his bath), and, as it would seem, by Hazael's hand (though Ewald calls this in question). Joram, king of Israel, and Ahaziah of Judah, leagued themselves against him, but were defeated (2 Kings viii. 28, ix. 15); and from Jehu, Joram's murderer and successor, Hazael took all his trans-Jordaniac provinces, and treated the inhabitants with ferocious cruelty (Amos i. 3 sq.); nor did he spare Judah, and was only diverted from marching against Jerusalem by a handsome tribute (2 Kings xii. 18). Hazel is mentioned in the cuneiform inscriptions of the eighth and being twice attacked by Shalmaneser II. See the Bible Dicts. of Winckelman, Riehm [and Smith], and Ewald's Hist. of Israel (iii.). Wolf Baudissin.

HEART OF JESUS, Society of. See Jesus' Heart, Society of.

HEAVE-OFFERINGS. See Offerings.

HEAVEN is (1) the upper part of the created world, which is mentioned before the earth, on account of its being nobler and more capacious than it (Gen. i. 1). The name is of divine origin, and designates the firmament which God set between the upper and the lower waters; that is, the space which extends above the earth (Gen. i. 6—8). It has been supposed by Alitzsch (Com. on Genesis) that the stars of the fourth day of
creation were developed out of the upper waters, just as the solid earth was developed out of the lower waters; and the facts of astronomy seem to favor this view, the density of Jupiter being no greater than that of water, and the density of Saturn being only half as great. But it is opposed by other representations (Gen. vii. 11; Ps. cxviii. 4), according to which the “waters” still continue to exist above the heavens. We are not, therefore, surprised to be told that, like the earth, so the created heavens will pass away (Matt. xxiv. 29, 35; Mark xiii. 25, 31; 2 Pet. iii. 10).

(2) Heaven also designates the place where God specially manifests his glory. It is his throne (Isa. lxvi. 1). “The heaven of heavens is the Lord’s: the earth he has given to the children of men” (Ps. cxv. 16). After the flood, sacrifices ascended to it (Gen. viii. 20). Heaven is in this case supermundane, as well as superterrene, distinct from the earth, and high above all created objects. God has revealed himself from heaven, since the beginning of the world (Ps. cxviii. 11, 15), through a covenant of grace, whose ultimate aim is the union of heaven and earth. In time the Hebrew nation was chosen as the representative of God’s kingdom on the earth, and the temple erected at Jerusalem which contained the mercy-seat, where the invisible God was present. But these were only shadows of good things to come (Heb. xi. 1). When the fulness of time was come, God revealed himself in Christ, who descended from heaven (John iii. 13), and announced the establishment of the kingdom of heaven amongst men. He made repentance the condition of membership in it, and taught men to pray to the heavenly Father that it is his “holy place” into which Christ entered when he ascended from the earth (Heb. ix. 11, 12) is nothing else than the holy of holies of heaven, the place of the glorious presence of God. This is heaven in its fullest, its real sense (Heb. ix. 24, “heaven itself”). There Christ, as the eternal high priest, is always advocating our cause, but in a way that he never did when he was on earth, or in the clouds (Eph. i. 23). He himself sits on the throne, whence such language as that “he was made higher than the heavens” (Heb. vii. 26), and “hath passed through the heavens” (Heb. iv. 14), “When the departure of Jesus from the world was in question, it was sufficient to say ‘into heaven’; but when the idea was to be expressed that all earthly limitation was removed, and every possible barrier between Jesus and God taken away, then the expression is used, ‘far above all the heavens’ (καιρείων κοίται των ουρανίων), or one like it” (Iofmann, Schriften, ii. 1, p. 535). It is this super spatial heaven, above the cloudy and the stellar heavens, both of which are transient, to which Paul refers when he speaks of the “third heaven” (2 Cor. xii. 2).

Those who partake of the benefits of Christ’s death and resurrection have their citizenship in heaven (Phil. iii. 20). Those who reject these do not have an interest in the progress of Christ’s kingdom on the earth (Luke xv. 7, etc.). But the created heavens (Gen. i. 1) and earth will pass away, and be replaced by new heavens and a new earth (2 Pet. iii. 10). Upon this new earth the heavenly Jerusalem will be let down (Rev. xxi.), which will be distinguished for holiness, and will be resplendent with glory (Rev. xxi. 11 sqq.).

The doctrine of heaven offers a large field for the fancy; and a spiritualistic tendency is to be avoided, which resolves the heavenly realities into mere ideas and unreal ideals, as well as a realism such as is represented by Swedenborg and Oberlin, and in works like Uranoglogie oder Beschreibung d. unsichtbaren Welt (Uranography, or a Description of the Invisible World, Ludwigs burg, 1856). It must be admitted that there is something real to correspond to the figures, and the one bears a relation to the other similar to that which exists between the glorified and natural body. [See Baxter: Saints’ Eeverlasting Rest, London, 1649; John Howe: The Blessedness of the Righteous opened, London, 1688; J. P. Lange: D. Land d. Herrlichkeit, Meurs, 1838; Harbaugh: Heaven, or the Tenant Dead, 3 vols., Philadelphia, 1848-53, and often since, etc.; the works on Theology, especially those of Hodge, Van Oosterzee, and Dorner; also Alger: Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life, 10th ed. Boston, 1878.]
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Arminian interpretation. He combined learning, and refinement of manners, with humility, and consecration to his work.


HEBREW LANGUAGE. The, is the language of the Hebrews, the descendants of Eber, or Heber, the ancestor of Abraham (Gen. xi. 14). In the Old Testament they called themselves "The Children of Israel," "Israel," "The House of Jacob," "Jacob;" but by the non-Israelite they were called "Hebrews" (Gen. xxxix. 14, xl. 12; Exod. i. 16, ii. 6; 1 Sam. iv. 6, xiii. 19), and so they called themselves in contradistinction to non-Israelites (Gen. xi. 15, xili. 32; Exod. i. 15, 19). Apparent exceptions are 1 Sam. xii. 3, 7, xiv. 21; but here the text may be corrupt, for the Septuagint reads, "Let the slaves revolt," "And those that crossed, crossed the Jordan," in the first two cases respectively. We are therefore naturally led to suppose that the designation "Hebrew" for the speech of the Israelites came from the non-Israelites, or from Greek-speaking Jews, since the expression ιπατερν occurs first in the Apocrypha and in the Prologue to Sirach (i.e., about 190 B.C.), to describe not only the old Hebrew language, but that of the later popular Aramaic of the Jews. The same phrase occurs in the New Testament (John v. 2, xix. 18, 17; cf. τισιακ διαλέκτον Acts xx. 40, xxii. 13, xxvi. 14). The Old Testament never applies the term "Hebrew" to the language: on the contrary, in Isa. xix. 18 it is called the "language of Canaan" when distinguished from that of the Egyptians, — an expression which indicates that it was the speech not only of the Israelites, but also of the inhabitants of Canaan. In 2 Kings xviii. 26, 28, Isa. xxxix. 11, 13, Neh. xiii. 24, the speech of the Judaites is called "Jewish," in distinction to the Aramaic.

As the Hebrews belonged to a family of nations, so their tongue was a member of a widely spread family of languages, usually denominated, since Eichhorn, "Shemitic." It is impossible to describe exactly its boundaries; but suffice it to say, its northern limit was the table-lands of Armenia, its eastern was the Tigris, its southern the Persian Gulf, and its western the Mediterranean Sea. [For the relations of the languages within these limits, see SHEMITIC LANGUAGES.]

The Hebrew occupied a middle position between the Aramaic and the North Arabic, and displayed the linguistic peculiarities of such a position. If it lacked the richness of expressions, the variety of forms, the complete vocalization, and the accentual distinctions, of the North Arabic, and displayed in many respects the Shemitic languages, Aramaic was next, and North Arabic last. But this does not imply that the Shemitic family passed through three stages to be so denominated: rather, these three tongues existed side by side. The age of the literature and that of the literary language is not the same as the age of the language. It is to follow, from the great age of the Hebrew literature, that the language itself is the provably most original form of the Shemitic; for this conclusion could only be reached when the development of the other languages of this family had proceeded under the same conditions and influences, and, above all, in the same time. But so far is this from the case, that it is certain that Aramaic, in less time than Hebrew, became a more degenerate language; that Hebrew in many respects resembles Aramaic, and more and more as we trace its influence in the successive books of the Old Testament; that Arabic presents really the oldest form of the language in spite of its late literature; and, finally, that Hebrew had already declined when its earliest books were written.

When and where Hebrew arose is unknown. Two conjectures are admissible. — Hebrew was the language of Abraham, brought with him from "Ur of the Chaldees" (Gen. xi. 31), i.e., Mugheir, south of Babylon, on the right bank of the Euphrates; or it was the language of the original inhabitants of Canaan. In favor of the latter is the distinction between Hebrew and Aramaic, which dates from patriarchal times (Gen. xxxvi. 47).

Since the proper names of the Edomites, Moabites, and Ammonites, are Hebrew, and since Old-Testament tradition declares these peoples to be closely related to the Israelites, these must have spoken Hebrew, as is strikingly shown by the Moabite stone, which dates from the first half of the ninth century B.C. (see art.). Differences of pronunciation and expression in different parts of Palestine are proven by the Shihboleté incident (Judg. xii. 6) and by Deborah's ode (Judg. v.). Dialectical differences are alluded to in Neh. xiii. 23, 24, and Matt. xxvi. 73. well.

It stands to reason that the Hebrew language must have undergone changes during the more than twelve centuries we are acquainted with it by books, inscriptions, and coins; yet the proof of this fact is difficult, and the result of all investigations to this end most meagre, for the following reasons. 1. No one period is fully represented; only fragments of its literature remain, as is proved by allusions in the books themselves: hence what is set down as peculiar to the age may be only a peculiarity of a writer. 2. It follows that it is impossible to decide certainly how old any particular book or other writing is, and therefore there can be no strict chronological arrangement. 3. In one book there may be quotations, more or less altered, from older books. In proof, compare the parallel passages in Kings and Chronicles. 4. From the time of Moses to the seventh century B.C., the Hebrew people were divided, and in the main peaceful, in the life of Israel, that their language would naturally undergo little change. Even when under tribute to Assyria, the Hebrews were not as a people molested. 5. In linguistic changes the vowels...
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suffer most; but the fact that in Hebrew writing only consonants are employed renders it well-nigh impossible to discover these vowel changes. The present Hebrew points are of comparatively late origin, and, although echoing an older tradition, are uniformly applied to all portions of the earlier and the later Old Testament alike.

Aramaic exercised a decided influence upon Hebrew from the end of the seventh century B.C. Its presence, therefore, is one note of time. Accordingly, in the history of Hebrew, it is customary to make the exile the dividing line. The first period extends to the exile. Attempts have been made to prove the greater age of the Pentateuch, as compared, e.g., with the other historical books, principally by citing the use in the former of the pronoun הָתַשׁ for the feminine הָתַשׁ (which also occurs in eleven places in the Pentateuch), the word יִתֶּנֶנ in the sense of "young one" and "girl," the word אֶנֶו for אֶנֶו (found only in the Pentateuch and in Chronicles). But, as these cannot be proven to be archaisms, they do not prove the antiquity of the language of the Pentateuch. Equally indecisive are the so-called antique forms in these books; because it would be easy, from any other number of books having the same number of words, to pick out an equal number of unusual forms, which with equal reason might be called "antique." As to the words and word-forms which occur only in the Pentateuch, or, if outside, only sporadically, it should be remembered that the Pentateuch constitutes one quarter of the whole Old Testament, and of each other quarter precisely the same thing is true; and, further, that the Pentateuch deals with matters not treated of in the remaining books. In the words peculiar to the Pentateuch there is not such a number of grammatical peculiarities as to prove the words archaic, or from which to argue the age of the writing. So much depends upon the individuality of the writer, upon his methods of approach and his purpose, that it is impossible to trace a development of the language in this period from age to age by a study of words. Thus, within the books and within sections of the same book, a mere increase in livelihood of tone leads to the introduction of poetic words; e.g., in the Pentateuch are sections which in this way differ from other sections and from other books, yet are they not on that account proven to belong to a different time. The same is the case in the historical books. The historic, the poetic, and the prophetic books have quite distinct purposes, and, in consequence, different vocabularies. The poets, further, were compelled, by their mode of writing by parables, to make use of out-of-the-way expressions, because they needed a larger stock of expressions than, say, the historians, who found the ordinary speech ready to their hand, and ample for their wants. The prophets used longer sentences, and shorter than the poets: otherwise, they have linguistically much in common. But, in spite of these differences, the laws of the language remained throughout the same.

The second period extends from the exile to the present day. It is characterized by the introduction of Aramaism. In the time of Hezekiah Aramaic was a foreign tongue (Isa. xxxvi.). In 720 B.C. the Northern Kingdom fell under the Assyrians; and, as the result of its troubles, Aramaic corrupted the language there. The Northern Kingdom, the conservativeness of which is characteristic of the heathen Hebrew, and of which, to the end of the seventh century, remained linguistically pure and vigorous. The same is the case in the historical books. The historic, the poetic, and the prophetic books have quite distinct purposes, and, in consequence, different vocabularies. They were the stock of expressions than, say, the historians, who found the ordinary speech ready to their hand, and ample for their wants. The prophets used longer sentences, and shorter than the poets: otherwise, they have linguistically much in common. But, in spite of these differences, the laws of the language remained throughout the same.

The second period extends from the exile to the present day. It is characterized by the introduction of Aramaism. In the time of Hezekiah Aramaic was a foreign tongue (Isa. xxxvi.). In 720 B.C. the Northern Kingdom fell under the Assyrians; and, as the result of its troubles, Aramaic corrupted the language there. The Northern Kingdom, the conservative nature of which is characteristic of the heathen Hebrew, and of which, to the end of the seventh century, remained linguistically pure and vigorous. The same is the case in the historical books. The historic, the poetic, and the prophetic books have quite distinct purposes, and, in consequence, different vocabularies. They were the stock of expressions than, say, the historians, who found the ordinary speech ready to their hand, and ample for their wants. The prophets used longer sentences, and shorter than the poets: otherwise, they have linguistically much in common. But, in spite of these differences, the laws of the language remained throughout the same.

The second period extends from the exile to the present day. It is characterized by the introduction of Aramaism. In the time of Hezekiah Aramaic was a foreign tongue (Isa. xxxvi.). In 720 B.C. the Northern Kingdom fell under the Assyrians; and, as the result of its troubles, Aramaic corrupted the language there. The Northern Kingdom, the conservative nature of which is characteristic of the heathen Hebrew, and of which, to the end of the seventh century, remained linguistically pure and vigorous. The same is the case in the historical books. The historic, the poetic, and the prophetic books have quite distinct purposes, and, in consequence, different vocabularies. They were the stock of expressions than, say, the historians, who found the ordinary speech ready to their hand, and ample for their wants. The prophets used longer sentences, and shorter than the poets: otherwise, they have linguistically much in common. But, in spite of these differences, the laws of the language remained throughout the same.
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Christian Church. He wrote a Hebrew grammar (1506), coined most of the technical terms which have since been in use in Hebrew grammars (status absolutus, affixum, verba quiescentia, etc.), and it is the foundation of the Hebrew learning in Germany. The Reformers cultivated and highly recommended the study of Hebrew; and the Protestant translations of the Bible were made directly from the original languages, and not from the Vulgate. During the seventeenth century, Buxtorf (father and son) of Basel, Louis Cappel of Saumur, and Salomon Gassius of Jena, were the most prominent Hebrew and Talmudic scholars. In the present century, Wilhelm Gesenius, professor in Halle (1786-1842), and Heinrich Ewald, professor in Göttingen (1803-79), created a new epoch in the study of Hebrew. Rodiger, Hupfeld, Hitzig, Furst, Delitzsch, and others are prominent in this department of learning. In our own country, Moses Stuart (1737-1828), James Addison Alexander of Princeton (d. 1859), Busb, Conant, and Green deserve special mention as Hebrew scholars. (See Schäff, in Johnson's Cyclopaedia.)


HEBREW POETRY will be considered in this article in three aspects,—the national, biblical, and technical. The first two have to do with the contents, character, and history of Hebrew poetry; the last with its form.

I. NATIONAL.—As with other peoples, so among the Hebrews, poetry precedes prose. In the Bible we have record of many events which were embodied in popular songs. In this way the national heart was fired by the stories of Samson and the Philistines (Judg. xv. 18) and of David and Goliath (1 Sam. xviii. 7). But there were longer poems which described battles and victories, such as Num. xxvi. 27-30, and, above all, Deborah's ode (Judg. v.), the crown of the patriotic poetry of Israel, and the oldest long Hebrew poem which has come down to us. Domestic histories furnished descriptive poems: so the sad fate of Jephthah's daughter was commemorated by the virgins of Gilead (Judg. xi.), the rape by the Benjaminites of the virgins of Shiloh (Judg. xxiv.). The finding of a fountain was the occasion of a new song (Num. xxii. 17). Abandoned women used singing to promote their ends (Isa. xxxii. 15). Singing, and playing upon instruments of music, formed prominent parts of public worship (2 Sam. vi. 15; Ps. xlviii. 20). The art of poetry was taught in the schools, and the orators and prophets were poets. Thus all times and occasions—love and beauty in peace, skill and daring in war—yielded materials to the poet, and naturally told their tale in verse. When the history of Hebrew literature comes to be written, the many beautiful poems will be properly estimated.

Many attempts have been made to divide Hebrew poetry into varieties, according to its peculiarities; but all such attempts must necessarily be uncertain, because we have but a single species in 'sufficient quantity to be a standard and the judgment can never be general. Still less successful must ever be the attempt to subject Hebrew poetry to the classifications usual with classic and modern poetry. The chief characteristics of Hebrew (or, more generally, of Semitic) poetry are these. 1. Subjectivity. The Hebrew poet deals only with what concerns him personally; hence there is no epic or drama, because these require objectivity. 2. Sententiousness. There is properly no beginning or end, no progress; so that the stanzas might be arranged differently without affecting the meaning of the poem in any way. 3. Sensuousness. In proof recall the imagery from the animal world,—the symbolism, the personifications, the very anthropomorphisms,
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which we find at times offensive, but which were
innate with the Hebrew. Hebrew poetry was at
first, of course, composed and repeated without
recourse to writing; but after a time anthologies
were compiled. Two such collections must have
been very early made; for we find in Num. xxi. 14
and Josh. x. 13 one to the "Book of the wars of Jehovah," and in Jos. x. 13 one to the "Book of Jaazer." Cf. 2 Sam. i. 18.

II. BIBLICAL. — It is grossly wrong to call the
Old Testament a "codex of Hebrew national
literature;" but it is certainly a reading and
schooled body of religion, compiled with this design
from the extant literature. In the collection,
Jewish scholars name three books as poetical,
Job, Psalms, and Proverbs, and have given these
a peculiar accentuation. But, besides these, the
Song of Solomon and Lamentations should be
so designated; and in the other books are fre-
quent passages of poetry, compiled with a purpose.
These books are written, compiled in every way, and run the
same infection. Joy and sorrow, defeat and victory,
personal and national emotions, find in
them expression. Often, however, the lyric shades
off into the didactic; e.g., in Job and in many of
the Psalms, and have given these
title "Book of the wars of Jehovah;"
and in Josh. x. 13 one to the "Book of Jaazer." Cf. 2 Sam. i. 18.
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these otherwise infinitely diversified forms are interchanged in most poems, and are arbitrarily mingled, and it is just this mingling which contributes to the poetic gradation. In the first four elegies of Jeremiah's Lamentations, and in many of the later Psalms, the elaborate structure is best seen.

The Hebrew poetry does not admit of scanning, and the assertion of Josephus that it was written in metre was wide of the truth. There was, however, more to it than parallelisms and strophes; viz., rhythm. But, as we have no knowledge of the ancient Hebrew pronunciation, we cannot read Hebrew poetry rhythmically.


Readers, and Date of Composition. — The term "Hebrews" does not limit the persons addressed to Hebrew-speaking Jews, in contrast to Hellenists, or the Jews that spoke Greek. The fact that the Epistle was written in Greek is evidence against this view; but the persons addressed were evidently of Hebrew birth. It is probable that it was not directed to the whole body of Jewish Christians, but to a particular congregation living in a definite locality; and the fact that the title refers, not to a place, but to the nationality of the readers, is to be explained by a distinction between the Hebrew and Gentile Christians in the locality where the persons addressed lived.

The opinion that the Epistle was addressed to Jewish Christians does not rest upon such passages as i. 1 (comp. 1 Cor. x. 1) or ii. 16 (comp. Rom. iv. 11—18), but upon the circumstance that the author regards his readers as the successors of pre-Christian Israel (iv. 1—9, vi. 12 sqq., vii. 7 sqq.), and that, while recognizing the universal efficacy of Christ's death (ii. 9, 15), he speaks only of its atoning and purifying power for the readers living in a definite locality where the persons addressed have been associated with the Epistle from the very earliest times.

This also follows from the exhortation to the Jews in xiii. 13, and, above all, from the opinions and tendencies which the whole Epistle combats. Its aim is not to present the "advantages of Christianity over Judaism" (Reuss, etc.), but to serve as a practical exhortation (xii. 22). This design becomes apparent in the solemn warning of ii. 1—4, which is based upon the doctrinal discussion of chap. i. Throughout the Epistle the doctrinal treatment is merely made the basis of practical exhortations. The readers who are in danger of a complete apostasy from the Christian faith are warned against the destruction which would follow upon a disregard of the proclamation of salvation (ii. 1—3, xii. 25), and exhorted to hold fast to the profession of their faith (iii. 1, iv. 14) and to the hope of the final glory (iii. 6, etc.). Those Israelites who believed in Jesus gain incomparably more than they lose by giving up Judaism; for Christ does perfectly, by his death and ascension, the work which the high priests of the Old Testament only typified (iv. 14—x. 18). The opinion which regards the
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readers as still taking part in the ordinances of the temple, and believing these were necessary to the forgiveness of sins (Bleek, Lünemann, Riehm), is at variance with the assertion that they had proved their faith by sufferings and works of charity (xii. 14, vi. 10, x. 22, 32). If this were true, and x. 27, 33 are described as having passed through a "great conflict of sufferings" (x. 32); which refers to the persecution of Nero (54-68), and not to that of Domitian (98-117). In the latter case, the composition of the Epistle would fall far down in the second century ("former days," x. 32), — a date utterly inconsistent with the use Clement and Hermas made of it, and with its theological character. But if the letter was written to the Hebrew Christians of Rome, and the persecution of x. 33 is identical with that of the year 64, the date cannot, on account of the expression "former days" (x. 32), be placed before 70, but may with tolerable accuracy be set down in 80. The use of the present tense in referring to the temple ritual (v. 1 sqq., viii. 4, ix. 6 sqq.) proves nothing, as it was natural to use this tense for a theoretical description of the temple, based upon the description of the law, and as it is used in the same connection by Josephus, Clement of Rome (ad Cor., 40, 41), and in the Talmud. The consideration which has been frequently urged, that, had the author written after the destruction of Jerusalem, he would have used that event as an argument in viii. 13, would only be of value if it were proved that the readers were in danger of reverting to Judaism. [Those who hold that the Epistle was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, in the year 70, emphasize, and justly, the constant use of the present tense in referring to the temple (v. 1, vii. 4, ix. 6, etc.) as still standing, and its ritual as being still observed. The past tense is otherwise frequently employed when the contrast is between the law and Christ (v. 10, ix. 18, etc.). The date is placed by Lardner, Davidson, and Schaff, in 63; Lange (Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, 1st ed.), Stuart, Tholuck, and Wieseler, in 64; Dr. Kay (Speaker's Commentary), in 65; De Wette, Riehn, and Ewald, in 65-67; Conybeare and Howson, in 68.]

Author. — Less can be determined definitely about the author than about the persons addressed. All that can be derived from the Epistle itself is that the writer was a Hebrew convert to Christianity, who was indebted for his conversion to the disciples of Jesus (ii. 3), was associated with Timothy (xiii. 23), and spoke with the authority of a teacher to a congregation among whom he had resided for a while (xiii. 14). The tradition about the authorship is not uniform. According to the Alexandrine tradition, reaching back to the second century, Paul was the author, and Clement of Alexandria attempts to explain...
his reasons for not introducing himself to his readers, as was his usual custom. Origen likewise attributes the Pauline authorship, but he recognizes that only a few churches besides the Alexandrine accepted this view. Irenæus (Eus., v. 20) and his pupil Hippolytus (Phot. Cod., 232, comp. 121), and the whole Church of the West, until after the beginning of the fourth century, denied the Pauline authorship. The tradition of the African Church (also reaching back to the second century) was that Barnabas was the author; and this view is expressly advocated by Tertullian (Eszat enim et Barnabæ titulus ad Hæbreos, etc.; De Pudic., 20).

In view of these differences, the opinion widely prevails that the name of the author was early lost, and that the names of Paul and Barnabas were mere conjectures. For this reason, Luther, Bleek, Lünemann, Hilgenfeld, and [Alford] have associated Apollos with the Epistle; but the latter is purely conjectural, and has far less in its favor than the names of Barnabas or Paul. Of these two Barnabas is to be preferred, and for the following reasons. (1) The hypothesis that Paul was the author was as easy for the Church of Alexandria as that of Barnabas was difficult for the Church of Africa. As the name of Paul had been inserted before the Epistles from ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπους τοις Ψαλίδαμος ("to the Romans," "to Philemon"), it was natural to insert it after the next Epistle, which was ἔκ τας Ἑβραίοις ("to the Hebrews"). Clement's second Epistle to the Corinthians experienced a similar fate. (2) The Barnabas tradition might have been more easily lost in the other parts of the Church than in the African, especially in the Alexandrine Church, which possessed a letter of similar import, which wrongly went under the name of Barnabas. This latter fact may easily be explained if we assume that there still remained a dim recollection of, for propagating the Gospel among the Heathen. From 1810 till 1810 he lived quietly in Bethlehem, preparing his two books, An Account of the United Brethren among the Delaware and Mohigan Indians (1740—1808, Phila., 1820). See Zeisberger (see art.).

HEBRON (friendship), a town of Palestine, situated about midway between Jerusalem and Beer-sheba, at an elevation of about three thousand feet above the sea, is one of the oldest cities in the world, built seven years before Tanis in Egypt (Num. xiii. 22). It is often mentioned in Old-Testament history, from the time of Abraham to the period of the Maccabees. By the Romans it was destroyed, but rebuilt during the middle ages, and the seat of a Christian bishop from 1167 to 1187, when it fell into the hands of Saladin. At present it numbers about ten thousand inhabitants, and is a hotbed of Mohammedan fanaticism. Its mosque stands over the cave of Machpelah, the burial-place of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; but it is closed against non-Mohammedans. There is not a Christian family in the town, but about five hundred Jews.

HEIKEWELDER, John Gottlieb Ernestus, Moravian missionary; b. in Bedford, Eng., March 12, 1743; d. in Bethlehem, Penn., Jan. 31, 1823. He emigrated to America, 1754, and labored for many years among the Indians in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan, in connection with David Zeisberger (see art.). From 1788 till 1810 he was agent of the Society of the United Brethren for propagating the Gospel among the Heathen. From 1810 till his death he lived quietly in Bethlehem, preparing his two books, An Account of the History, Manners, and Customs of the Indian Nations who once inhabited Pennsylvania and the Neighboring States (Phila., 1818), and A Narrative of the United Brethren among the Delaware and Houseland Indians (1740—1808, Phila., 1820). See RONDTHALER: Life of Heikewelder, Phila., 1847.

HEDIO, Kaspar, b. at Ettingingen, in Baden, 1494; d. at Strassburg, Oct. 17, 1553; studied at Freiburg and Basel, and was appointed court-preacher to the elector of Mayence in 1520, and in 1523 preached at the Cathedral of Strassburg, where he labored assiduously for the introduction of the Reformation. He translated Eusebius and parts of Ambrosius, Augustine, etc.; edited the Chronicon Urupergense, and continued it from 1280 to 1337; and wrote a Chronicum Germancum till 1543. His proper name was Heid.

HEDWIG, St., the wife of Duke Henry of Silesia and Poland, to whom she bore six children, devoted the last forty years of her life to the severest asceticism, and entered, after the death of her husband (in 1238), the convent of Trebnitz, where she died Oct. 15, 1248. She was canonized in 1266, and her festival is celebrated in the Roman Church on Oct. 17.

HEERBRAND, Jakob, b. at Giengen, in Swabia, Aug. 12, 1521; d. at Tubingen, May 22, 1600; studied at Ulm and Wittenberg, and was appoint-
ed preacher in Tübingen, 1544, but discharged in 1548, as he refused to accept the Interim. In 1550 he was made superintendent of Herrenberg, and in 1557 professor of theology at Tübingen. His principal work is his Compendium Theologicum (Teutonic and Wissenschaft, 1574). This was widely used in Germany as a text-book, and translated into Greek on account of the negotiations then going on between the Patriarch of Constantinople and the University of Tübingen.

HEGEL, Georq Weidenfried, b. at Stuttgart, Aug. 27, 1770; d. in Berlin, Nov. 14, 1831. He studied theology at Tübingen 1788-93; and lived as a private tutor, first at Bern 1793-96, then at Frankfort 1797-1801. In 1801 he settled at Jena as lecturer on philosophy in the university, and Schelling's co-editor of the Kritische Journal der Philosophie. He was at that time fully agreed with Schelling. Their journal, of which he wrote the larger part, was the organ of the system of identity,—a philosophy which attempted to represent matter and mind, nature and spirit, world and God, as identical. But a closer acquaintance showed him, that, in the system of Schelling, this identity was a play of the imagination rather than a logical ratiocination, "shot from a pistol," rather than developed with spontaneous necessity; and when Schelling went to Würzburg in 1803, and the charm of the personal intercourse faded away, Hegel left the track and chose his own way, though the general direction of his thought continued the same. After the battle of Jena (1806), he removed to Bamberg, where for some time he edited the Bamberger Zeitung. The occupation was exceedingly modest, but at the same time he published in his Phänomenologie des Geistes, a book which in wealth of ideas has no equal. From 1808 to 1816 he was a schoolmaster, director of the Aegidien gymnasium at Nuremberg, and there he married in 1810, and published his Philosophische Wissenschaft der Logik; which latter work forms the foundation of his whole system, and is as deep and as forbidding as any cellar can be. In 1816 he was appointed professor of philosophy at Heidelberg, and in 1818 he was removed to Berlin; but in Berlin he published only his Phänomenologie des Rechts (his weakest work), and essays and papers in the Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik. After his death, his works were edited, in eighteen large volumes, by an association of friends, after his own notes and those of his hearers. Translated into English are The Subjective Logic (by Sismoni and Wallou, 1853), Philosophy of History (by Sibree, 1837), the Logic, from the Encyclopädie (1874), large selections from his works in the Journal of Speculative Philosophy (edited by W. T. Harris, L.-V., St. Louis, 1867-71). His masterpieces are Phänomenologie des Geistes, Science of Logic, and History of Philosophy; in second line stand Natural Philosophy, Philosophy of Right, Philosophy of History, and Philosophy of Religion.

The impression which Hegel made in Germany was at one time almost overpowering. His philosophy swept away all other philosophies as if they were mere dust, and before he died it began to make itself felt as an actual power both in State and Church. Nevertheless, immediately after his death a split took place in the school he had formed; the two divisions (the right represented by Gabler, Erdmann, Gaun, Rosenberg; the left, by Feuerbach, Bruno Bauer, Michelet, and Arnold Ruge) moving in diametrically opposite directions both in politics and religion. The fact is surprising, but not inexplicable. There was in Hegel personally a fund of religious, moral, and poetical sentiment, as rich as his power of intellect was grand. In his system of strongly pronounced pantheism, both these elements are perfectly fused together into one mass; but it was not to be wondered at, that, by further development, they should separate, each pursuing its own course. The method offered no resistance. Formally Hegel defined truth as the mediation between two opposites. His thought always moves from thesis, through antithesis, to synthesis, from the positive, through the negative, to the absolute. But this method is as acceptable to ecstatic mysticism as to radical rationalism. In the dispute which was caused by the split, the style came to play a curious but significant part. Hegel's style is an almost noiseless, almost colorless stream of molten steel, dangerous to touch. Racy expressions, pithy sayings, even bursts of lofty eloquence, occur; but they have no value as quotations. The word which stands for an idea, and not merely runs an errand in the sentence, never means the same in Hegel's writings as it means in other people's writings. Hegel said himself, "If you will understand my ideas, you must first understand my system." In the same sense it may be said, that while in other people's writings the reader begins by understanding the words, and thence reaches to the understanding of the book, in Hegel you must understand the book before you can understand the words. Hence the reason why no amount of interpretation and explanation has been able to decide any thing with respect to what Hegel really meant. The whole dispute between the two factions of his school has been a mere waste, more liable to confound the student than capable of illustrating the author.

The right wing of the Hegelian school is in the theology represented by Daub, Marheineke, Göschel, Martensen; the left, by D. F. Strauss, F. C. Baur, Schweitzer. Religion, Hegel defines as truth, but in the lowest form in which truth can be held by the human mind. In Christianity this form of truth has found its highest, its absolute expression, having passed through the stages of one-sided objectivity and one-sided subjectivity in the ante-Christian religions. On the first stage God is considered an object, at the second stage man as a natural being (Lamaism, Buddhism, Brahminism); on the second he is considered as subject, wholly distinguished from nature (Judaism, Greek and Roman polytheism); but only in Christianity he becomes the true spirit. The Hegelian idea, however, of God as spirit, is something (for instance, with respect to the question of personality); and the specifically Christian question,
HEGESIPPUS, an ecclesiastical writer of the second century, of whose work, if any was extant, no fragments have come down to us in Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., 2, 23; 3, 11. 16. 19; 20, 32; 4, 8, 22) and in Stephanus Gobanus in Photius (Biblioth., c. 292); which fragments have been collected in Grabe (Spicilegium, I.), Routh (Rel. Sacr., I.), and Schultess (Symbola ad internam criten lib. can., I., Turin, 1833).

Eusebius says nothing about the country and birthplace of Hegesippus; but from the circumstance that the latter in his book gives extracts from the Gospel according to the Hebrews and Syrian and Hebrew phrases in his text, and quotes from an oral Jewish tradition, he infers that he was born a Jew; and he must have resided in the Orient, since he went to Rome by sea, making a visit by the way to Corinth. With respect to the time of his life, Eusebius fixes three points,—the reigns of Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius; and these three points fit well together with the notices by Jerome that he was born not long after the apostolic age, and, in the Chron. Pasch., that he died during the reign of Commodus.

As all the fragments which have come down to us are of a historical character, we have inferred that the work itself was a kind of church history; but as the death of James is told in the fifth and last book, what can the preceding four books have contained? and where was the history after the death of James to be told? Others have supposed that the work gave ecclesiastical statistics; others, again, that it was a sort of itinerary. With respect, however, to the general purpose of the book, there can be no doubt it was polemical against the Gnostics; and a closer examination of the fragments themselves, as well as the notices which Eusebius gives of the general style of the paragraphs from which he quotes, points to a book of polemico-apologetical description.

Still greater differences of opinion have arisen with respect to the true spiritual bearing of those fragments. Eusebius thinks that Hegesippus was a converted Jew, and his opinion may be right; but on the basis of this assumed Jewish descent, and certain assumed Judaizing tendencies in the narrative about Simeon and James, Hegesippus has been set forth as the representative of a Christianity not only Judaizing, but Jewish. From a notice in Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., 4, 22) it has been inferred that he considered the Mosaic law as an indispensable part of Christianity. From another notice in Photius (Biblioth., c. 292) it has been inferred that he did not recognize the apostle Paul; and from these inferences still further and very far-reaching inferences have been drawn by Schwegler, and, in a more considerate way, by Hilgenfeld, with respect to the Jewish character of the primitive Christian Church. But these propositions are untenable.

The first notice does not speak of the Mosaic law in particular, but of the general unity of the Old and New Testament revelation. The second notice does not speak of the apostle Paul, but of a whole party; viz., the Gnostics. To recognize the congregation of Corinth and the Epistle of Clement in the manner in which Hegesippus recognized them, and then reject the apostle Paul, would be an inexplicable self-contradiction.

—HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.

HEIDELBERG CATECHISM. The Reforma

From Hegelian premises; and the eat boast of conservative orthodoxy, and then as proof of his faith and science had become fully reconcile, first by Marheineke, and then by Bruno Bauer, that is, first as evidence of the author's conservative orthodoxy, and then as proof of his revolutionary radicalism.

Clemens Petersen.


C. WEIZSACKER.
the norm of faith; but the forms of worship were regulated after the Reformed rather than the Lutheran type. Friedrich III. (1559—76), one of the noblest princes of that period, a complete and consistent reform was carried out; and, as the basis of the new organization, the Heidelberg Catechism was adopted.

Zacharias Ursinus and Caspar Olevianus were chosen by the elector with the consent of his successor, Friedrich III. (1559—76), one of the noblest princes of that period, a complete and consistent reform was carried out; and, as the basis of the new organization, the Heidelberg Catechism was adopted. The former was professor of systematic theology at the university, the latter preacher at the electoral court of Heidelberg; but both had lived in Geneva and Zurich, and were strongly influenced by the Swiss reformation. As basis for their work they used the catechisms of Calvin (edition of 1541), of Lasky (1548), of Monheim (1560), and of Bullinger (1559); though of the last for their worship they used the catechisms of Calvin and most widely used catechisms of Protestantism (the other two being the Smaller Catechism of Luther and the shorter Westminster Catechism). A tercentenary celebration was held by the German Reformed Church in the United States at Philadelphia, 1863, and in several places in Germany and Holland.

Lit. — The text of the catechism is found in the collections of symbolical books by Niemeyer (Leipzig, 1840), Hille (Elberfeld, 1860), and Philip Schaff (New York, 1863). Special additions have been published by Philip Schaff: D. Heidelberg Katechism nach der ersten Ausg. von 1568 (of which only two copies are known to exist), Philadelphia, 1863 (2nd ed., 1869), accompanied with critical notes and an historical survey; The Heidelberg Catechism in German, Latin, and English, with an Hist. Introduction (by J. W. Nevin), New York, 1863; and A. Walters, Bonn, 1864.


Guder.

Heidelberg. See Gregor von Hibernia.

Heinecius (Heineck), Johann Michael, b. at Eisenberg, Dec., 12, 1674; d. at Halle, Sept. 11, 1722; studied at Jena and Giessen, and was appointed deacon of Goslar 1699, pastor at Halle 1709, and consistorial inspector of the Saale-circle 1720. His work on the history of the Greek Church, old and new (Leipzig, 1711), is based on the great collections of materials made by Petræus Arendius, Leo Allatius, Richard Simon, and others, and is still of value. He also wrote some learned essays on the history of Goslar, the house of Brandenburg, etc.

Helding, Michael. See Sidonius.

Helena, St., the wife of Constantius Chlorus, and the mother of Constantine the Great. Very little is known with certainty of her life. Gloucester in England, Naissus in Upper Moesia, and Drepanum on the Gulf of Nicomedia, claim to be her birthplace. A church in Rome, another in Venice, and the monastery of Hautvilliers, near Rheims, claim to possess her remains. Some say she was a British princess; others, a servant-girl in a wayside inn. She was repudiated for political reasons by her husband, but held in great honor by her son. She was a Christian; and the study of the legends (see Cross, Invention of) which have clustered around her name forms an interesting parallel to the history of the worship of Mary. See Act. Som.,

HELIODORUS, minister of the Syrian king, Seleucus IV. Philopator, 187-175 B.C.; was sent to Jerusalem to enforce the surrender of the temple-treasure. In spite of warning given, he entered the temple, but was, according to 2 Macc. iii. 6-40, thrown to the ground by a fearful apparition, and restored only on the intercession of the high priest Onias. 4 Macc. iv. 4, which narrates the same event, mentions Apollonius, Syrian governor of Cæsarea, instead of Heliodorus.

HELIODORUS, Bishop of Tricca in Thessaly, originated, according to Socrates (Hist. Eccl., 5, 22), the custom, prevailing in Thessaly, of depositing any ecclesiastic, who, after receiving consecration, did not abstain from the races.
2. In the New Testament.—"Hell" is the translation in the authorized version of three words in Greek.—Hades, Gehenna, and Tartarus. Hades has been already considered. Gehenna was properly the "hell" of Hebrew conception, and is uniformly so rendered in the revised version. The rebellious angels, and the finally impenitent of men, are cast into it (Matt. v. 22; Luke xii. 5). Once the word "Tartarus" is employed (2 Pet. ii. 4), and also rendered "hell," it is noticeable that neither Paul nor John uses either Hades, Gehenna, or Tartarus, and also, that, of the twelve recurrences of Gehenna, eleven are in our Lord's speeches. Scripture mercifullyhidesthe condition of the lost, and by example forbids prurient curiosity. The way of life is luminous from earth to heaven: the way of death is lost in darkness. See Gehenna; Hades; Sheol; Punishment, Future.

HELL, Christ's Descent into (κατάβασις εἰς φόνον), one of the clauses in the Apostles' Creed, was treated by the Council of Sirmium (359) in the East at least as early as Marcion's time, and is found in the formula of the fourth synod of Sirmium (359). Towards the latter part of the fourth century it formed, according to the testimony of Rufinus (Expos. Aquileja, 18), a part of the baptismal confession of the Church of Aquileja. But, in the great majority of the baptismal formulae until the sixth century, it was wanting. By the eighth, however, it was universally accepted. Its insertion, therefore, into the creed, was a matter of gradual development. The Greek Church regards the descent into hell as a voluntary passage of Christ's human soul into Hades in order to offer through the preaching of the gospel, redemption to such as were held under the dominion of Satan on account of original sin, and to transfer believers to paradise, especially the saints of the Old Testament (Conf. orth., I. 48). The Roman-Catholic Church holds that the whole divine-human personality of Christ descended to the Limbus patrum, or the place where the saints of Israel were detained, in order to deliver them into the full enjoyment of blessedness (Cat. Rom., § 100-106). According to the Lutheran theology, Christ descended with body and soul on the early morning of the resurrection, just before his appearance as the risen one on the earth. The interval between the crucifixion and that time he had spent in paradise. He went to the realm of death unto death to others, as hades consists of two domains,—paradise, or Abraham's bosom, and the place of torment. The second part of the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus, which belongs probably to the fourth century, is known also by the title Descent of Christ to the Underworld, and contains a somewhat similar account of Christ's experiences in hades. Hades is represented as resisting the entrance of Christ; but the news of Christ's coming produces a joyful commotion among the inhabitants of his realm. These cry out, with David and Isaiah among them, in the language of Ps. xiv., to Hades: "Lift up the gates of thy kingdom. The bright light from the advancing Son of man then strangely floods the realm of death. He calls his saints to him, and followed by them, Adam being in the number, he ascends from the underworld. Arrived at the gates of paradise, he gives them over to the hand of Michael, who introduces them to its glorious fellowship. See Hades.

Lit.—John Pearson: Exposition of the Creed, 1659; Peter King: Hist of the App. Creed, etc., London, 1702; Withers: Exercit. s. i. c. xvii. 1
HELENIStIC IDIOM.

HELL.

Amat., 1730 [Eng. trans. by Fraser, Edinb., 1823, 2 vols.]; Dietzelmayr: Hist. dogm. de descensu, etc., Nürnberg, 1741; Wagner: De eateia, art., quo in symb. Ap. tradition J. Chr. ad ver. Christ., Copenhagen, 1858; Kinkel: Lehre v. Chr. Höljenfahr., Frankf., 1842; Güder: Lehre v. d. Erscheinung Chr. unter d. Tollen, Bern, 1852; especially Zeitschrift: Petri Ap. de Chr. ad inferos descensu sententia, Leipzig, i. 1857; A. Schweizer: Hinsichts der Stille als Mythos ohne bibl. Begründung, Zürich, 1858; [ISAAC actaeal, art., quo in symb. A. traditur J. Chr. ad inferos descensu sententia, Leipzig, ii. i. 1857; KÜHN: Barrow: Sermons and Exposition of the Creed, Amst., 1730 [Eng. trans. by Fraser, Edinb.]; Barrow: Greek language was learned, not from the Greeks, but in the Jewish families, as if it had been the mother-tongue. Thus the imperfections, to a certain extent, became parts of this form of Greek, taught by Jews to their children. In later times, Herodotus, such as Philo and Josephus, sought to adopt the classic forms; but we should not class these, or some of the Christian authors of the first century, with the representatives of the Hellenistic idioms, properly so called.

A point often misunderstood in this discussion is the state of the Greek language itself at the time when the Jews adopted it. It was, in consequence of the conquests of Alexander and their results, in process of change; so much so, that attention was aroused, and studies fostered, out of which the science of philology arose. The mass of foreign words introduced in consequence of the geographical extension of the language, affected it very little. Such things rarely do. But the new political organizations, which threw into the background the limited forms of Greece, had also the effect of fusing the provincial dialects into one common universal Greek language, which always occurs when national life triumphs over narrower separating tendencies. In Greece itself the common people still used their own dialect, as in Germany to-day; but in the newer cities, where the population was not of the same origin, the so-called common or mixed dialect prevailed. The basis of this was the Attic. But a common dialect is of necessity a mixed speech, retaining much that is of local origin, and adding much that is new. The old grammarians have collected for us all these phenomena; and the results are given in our better lexicons, especially those of the New Testament. A Macedonian element is also discoverable: at least, we find certain things appearing in the language for the first time during the Macedonian supremacy.

But the influence of Alexandria on this form of the Greek language was most potent. In that city were combined social culture, trade, art, science, literature, so as to found an intellectual supremacy which continued for centuries. Hence we may speak of an Alexandrian dialect, which belonged not only to literature, but to social life in general. This is known to us from the manuscripts of the New Testament, and is held by many of the modern critics to be the very form of speech used by the apostles in composing their writings. From this it would follow that the printed Greek text of modern times is of more recent origin in its forms. But into this discussion we cannot enter.

The chief matter to be considered is what the Greek language became in the hands of these Orientals, especially in its application to religious thought. As is well known, the Pentateuch was translated into Greek at Alexandria, during the reign of the second Ptolemy; that is, at a time when a race of Jews flourished whose fathers had been the first to whom the use of the Greek language became a necessity. Despite the fables which have been attached to the story of this version, we may be confident that it originated in an ecclesiastical necessity which was already felt, and not on the literary whim of a prince as is generally represented. Greek literature would have been engaged upon it, if the latter view were correct. In fact, the fables alluded to point to an origin deemed sacred, rather than to one of interest mainly to learned librarians. The king's name can be regarded as that of the patron saluted by the Jews, and a dedication copy was naturally placed in
the royal library by these faithful subjects. Be
this as it may, the first glance shows how little knowledge of the Greek this translation
was attempted. Even the parts made after an interval, the length of which cannot be exactly
determined, show in general the same character. Aside from blunders due to faulty hermeneutics 
or a corrupt text, we find numberless examples of the misuse of Greek terms, of Hebraistic con-
structions, such as could be fully understood only by those who thought in Hebrew. It is true 
that adequate Greek expressions were wanting for many ideas of religion and ritual: for others, 
these unread translators knew of none among the linguistic material collected in the market and 
the shop. They chose the nearest equivalent, without reference to usage, just as beginners in a 
foreign tongue are wont to do. We are familiar with such Hebraisms: what must a Greek have 
thought them for their use of the art of speech. John, for example, does not represent the coarser 
Hellenism in his choice of words; but how entirely Hebraistic is his syntax! The sentences follow 
each other, the connection appearing, not from grammatical analysis, but from theological reflec-
This formulation of an attack is not Greek. On the other hand, what rhetorical periods are found in the Epistle to the Hebrews, 
in the preface of Luke, in some of the discourses in the latter part of the Book of the Acts: In 
Paul's language we plainly see two partially antagonistic tendencies, that of the Jewish dia-
lactics, with its incomplete syllogisms, its inter
fountain of life, representing wealth of feelin
rhetoric of the heart, the true issue of a new 
rationalization of personal issues, and its profound connection between it and the mental 
history of the people who produced it. The hints have been confined too much to lexical
and grammatical analysis; but there were variations in this literature, the causes of which 
we must indicate. The chief cause is, that not 
all of the authors possessed the same linguistic training. Some were more gifted than others, 
and the difference in the style of the books composing the so called Old Testament Apocrypha 
is very great, although all of them have the Hel-
enistic coloring. The same difference exists in the New Testament also. Compare the style of the Epistle to the Hebrews and that of the Apoc
rphpha, which is Hebraistic through and through. 
It is evident that the authors of the New Testa-
tament differed in their use of the art of speech. 
Stephanus and Beza took the right view; but their investigations were too imperfect to guide 
public opinion. In the middle of the seventeenth century there began an interminable squabble 
over the Hebraisms of the New Testament. the point at issue being a dogmatic one; namely, 
what kind of a style might be ascribed to the Holy Spirit, whether it could be deemed less pure 
than the classic or less than the false authors. The discussion was mechanical and unscientific on 
both sides, but lasted for more than a century. (See the Introduction to Winer's Grammar of the New Testament). Fortunately during this cen-
tury a truer method has been adopted; and the lexical and grammatical results are not only
Much remains to be done in two directions: first, in securing for the LXX. proper recognition as the basis of the peculiarities of the Hellenistic diction; secondly, in giving place to New-Testament stylistics and rhetoric. The latter subject has been discussed and rediscussed in connection with the questions of the genuineness of the various books of the New Testament; but very little has been done from any point of view other than the polemic one. The rhetoric of the Pauline Epistles deserves more thorough treatment.

The numerous works which have appeared in recent years on the life of Christ, on the history of the New-Testament times, have made great use of the material which belongs to a thorough discussion of the Hellenistic diction; and the same remark holds true of the treatises on New-Testament hermeneutics. For a general discussion of the language of the Greek Testament and the idioms of the evangelists and apostolic writers, we refer to the first chapter of Schaff's Companion to the Study of the Greek Testament, New York, 1882.

HELLENISTS was the name applied by the Greeks to those foreigners who became like themselves in habits or speech. The term had a special application to those Jews who were brought under Greek influences, and is of importance in connection with the early history of Christianity. The usual view of the word is not incorrect, but too often superficial.

In the time of Alexander the Hellenizing of foreign nations, which until then had been limited, began to be extensive. His successors, the Seleucids and the Ptolemies, advanced it, sometimes by force. Even more than the sword was this influence the defence of the new dynasties.

The tendency to emigrate, and engage in foreign trade, was not, however, confined to the Greeks. About the time of the spread of Hellenic civilization in the East, various political causes fostered among the Jews the same tendency, which has now become, so to speak, the ground tone of their life as a people. The two streams, Hellenic and Hebrew, met at first in the young Macedonian cities. Soon the Jews were found everywhere manifesting the same commercial spirit, the same fondness for portable salable property, which is to-day the most obvious trait of their character. But the two streams did not mix. The Mosaic law had sought to fasten the Jewish people to the soil of Palestine. From this external regulation they now broke away; but the same law had stamped upon them, not only a higher religious and ethical culture, but also a personal abhorrence of foreigners. All that pertained to their religious belief made between them and the Greeks an impassable gulf, thus guarding their religion from every danger and temptation, maintaining their peculiar type of morality, while at the same time all the excitations which can divide races were permitted to arise and to operate. We are to inquire, How far, under these conditions, did the Jewish element yield to or withstand the foreign influence it encountered? In other words, What spheres of public and private life, what phases of national character, were affected or unaffected by this Hellenizing tendency?
HELVENISTS.

With household life we need not here concern ourselves. In art and science the foreigners might have furnished a welcome instructor to the Jews, so far as these troubled themselves about such things. The result of it all was that little remained was connected with religious ideas in a way to remove it from the usual political sphere. Moreover, trade is essentially cosmopolitan; and every advance in this direction was at bottom a removal from the spirit of the law and the prophets, all the more so because the Jews did not recognize it as such. The two opposing dynasties on either side of Palestine sought at the same time to obtain entrance into the land and the heart of the Jewish people. Assuring them of material advantage, encouraging their love of money, these rulers succeeded in dulling entirely the conservative national feeling, though without winning any affection in return. Without the mighty restraint of their religion, the Jewish people would at once, and more rapidly than any, have given way to Hellenism. The strongest proof of this, aside from the affectation of adding Greek names, is to be found in the fact that they sacrificed what is most precious and peculiar to a people,—their language, and this with an unexampled readiness and rapidity. This remarkable revolution in speech has been discussed in the preceding article [HELLENISTIC IDIOM].

But, though the language of their fathers was forgotten, their religious faith remained, as it still remains. This preserved their nationality; and one cannot fail to admire not only the reorganization after the return from Babylon, with its effect upon the people, but also the Pharisaism, which, with its separatism, contributed so largely to the maintenance of the undying national feeling. An edifice that has lasted for thousands of years, that has proved stronger than the Roman Empire, itself praises the builders. However far removed from home, among the Jews apostasy was a rare exception. Wherever they went, they soon established synagogues (now Grecian) as fortresses of the national spirit, and targets of foreign antipathy,—in both directions the upholders of Judaism in its peculiar position.

Here is that phase of our subject which is of most importance for the history of Christianity; here the providential ordering of the relations of peoples is most evident. The transformation of Hebrew Jews into Hellenists is of more than statistical and philological interest: its results were far-reaching. It was more than the acceptance of the Greek language and customs on the part of the Jews: it brought the Jewish faith and life close to the Greek population, and that, too, at the very time when heathenism was moving toward a remediless catastrophe. Its power was broken: in some cases a tasteless, unpooetic, foreign superstition had taken its place. Here and there were individual souls that could not find satisfaction, either in the intoxication of sense, the abstractions of philosophy, or the prevalent mysteries and occult sciences. These often found their way to the synagogue, and learned to know the God of Israel, and to join in the worship of his name. Especially was this true of the women. No one was hindered from sharing these privileges. The relations of commercial and social life favored the custom. Certain general rules of a religious and domestic character were observed in the introduction of these proselytes [see PROSELYTES]; otherwise the fellowship was without any religious form.

But an important counter-influence was thus exerted upon the Hellenistic Jews. It could not be otherwise. The Greek-speaking Jews were brought into the closest contact with the Greeks, and inevitably they learned to judge the aliens less unfavorably, to recognize what was common to humanity, and, while holding fast to their monotheism as their most precious possession, to cease to identify it with all the details of their religious forms. Their worship, it should be remembered, was, insensibly to them, less and less associated in their thoughts with the temple at Jerusalem and its sacrificial rites. The Hellenist, without wishing or knowing it, was more and more released from the bonds of the Levitico-Pharisaical institutions. He had preachers, but no priest. This change was not caused by antagonism or indifference, but was the natural result of the cult of saving Greek names, the Jews did not become less exclusive; the Book of the Acts furnishes proof to the contrary: but the same history shows how greatly the circumstances sketched above prepared the way for the gospel. Those things made prominent by the gospel, that, too, by Jesus himself,—the distinction between what was essential and unessential in religion, the recognition of true faith outside of Israel, and of salvation designed for all nations,—these things, to say the least, were intelligible to the Hellenistic ear, if not at once acceptable. In Palestine, where the Jew wished to be master, the foreigner was doubly unwelcome, was called sinner, godless, unrighteous, because he was a foreigner. These national prejudices helped to create antagonism to the gospel. But elsewhere the Jew was the foreigner. He soon felt that there was room in the world for many kinds of people; he had lost its influence within the sphere of Christianity. In Jerusalem, a Jew would not hear of a gospel that they should have in common with the uncircumcised. In Antioch, not only the market, but the synagogue, to a certain extent, had been occupied together with the latter class. The depth of the gulf between these two elements of the Jewish people at the time of the establishment of the Church may be learned from the first mention of them in the Book of the Acts (chap. vi.). The unfriendly collusion was occasioned, it is true, by a trivial external matter; but the true cause was the national division. The further application of the positions here taken belongs more properly to exegesis.

ED. REUSSE (M. B. RIDDLE).

HELVETIC CONFESSIONS. I. First Helvetic Confession (Confessio Helvetica Prior, also called Second Confession of Basel, Confessio Basiliensis Posterior). Though in the fourth decade of the sixteenth century the Reformed churches of Switzerland could point to the writings of Zwingli and the first confession of Basel (1534) as expressions of their beliefs, a common confession, formally adopted, was still lacking. For the purpose of drawing up such an instrument, the leading clergy of Basle, Zurich, Schaffhausen, St. Gall, Mühlenhausen, and Biel, assembled...
HELVETIC CONFESSIONS, Formula Consensus Ecclesiarum Helveticarum. The severity with which the synod of Dort (1618-18) defined the doctrines of absolute election and reprobation gave rise to a re-action in France, where the Protestants lived surrounded by Roman Catholics. Saumur, the home of Amyraut, Cappel, and Placeuex, became the centre of this movement. Amyraut taught a hypothetical or conditioned universalism; Cappel denied the verbal inspiration of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament; Placeuex rejected the immediate imputation of Adam's sin as arbitrary and unjust. These ideas found much favor, both in France and in Switzerland; but in the latter country they also met with a very decided opposition.

F. Spanheim wrote against Amyraut: the city of Zürich called her sons home from Saumur, and sent them to study at the orthodox Montauban. In 1649 A. Morus, the successor of Spanheim, but suspected of belonging to the liberal party, was compelled by the magistrates of Geneva to subscribe to a series of articles, in the form of theses and antitheses, the first germ of the Formula Consensus. As the movement continued to spread, the idea naturally occurred to stop the further invasion of such novelties by the establishment of a formula obligatory to all teachers and preachers. After considerable discussion between Gernler of Basel, Hummel of Bern, Ott of Schaffhausen, Heidegger of Zürich, and others, the last-mentioned was charged with drawing up the formula. In the beginning of 1675 it was laid before the ministers of Zürich; and in the course of the year it was adopted, not only by Zürich, but also by Basel, St. Gall, Glarus, Appenzell, Mühlenhausen, Neuenburg, the Grisons, etc. It consists of a preface and twenty-six canons, and gives a clear statement of the difference between strict Calvinism and the school of Saumur. Though a product of the reigning scholasticism, and hence styled a "symbolical afterbirth," it is by no means an exclusive as might be suspected: it disapproves the ideas of the school of Saumur, but does not directly declare them to be heretical. Outside of Switzerland it never acquired authority; and, even in Switzerland itself, it gradually dropped out of use in the course of half a century. In 1725 Prussia and England applied to the respective magistracies of the Swiss cantons for the abolition of the formula for the sake of the unity and peace of the Protestant churches. The reply was somewhat evasive; but, though the formula was never formally abolished, it gradually fell entirely into disuse.

LIT. — The formula was first printed as an appendix to the Second Helvetic Confession at Zürich 1714, then 1718, 1722, etc., and in Niemeyer: Col. Conf., pp. 729-739. For its history see Barnaud: Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire, etc., Amat., 1726; Schweizer: Die prot. Centralbogen, Zürich, 1858; [Schaff: Creeds of Christendom, N.Y., 1877, vol. i. 477, where the lit. is given in full.]

F. Trechsel.

HELVETIUS, Claude Adrien, b. at Paris, January 1715; d. there Dec. 26, 1771; was the son of a farmer-general; a farmer-general himself, a rich man, and an idle devotee of the idea of making a sensation. He succeeded. His
HELVICUS.

HENDERSON, Alexander, b. in the parish of Cricht, Fife-shire, in 1583; d. in Edinburgh, Aug. 19, 1646. He entered St. Salvator's College, St. Andrew's, in December, 1599, and took the degree of M.A. in 1603. He taught philosophy in St. Andrew's University till early in 1612, when he was presented to the church of Leuchars. So unpopular was his settlement there, that the people fastened the church-doors on the day of his ordination, and he had literally to enter by the window. A year or two afterwards he went, perhaps out of curiosity, to hear Robert Bruce preach in the adjoining parish of Forgan. In order to be hid, he sat in a dark corner of the church; and there the sharp arrows of the King pierced his heart as Bruce read for his text, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber." Soon after this he gave up Episcopacy for Presbytery, and in 1618 opposed "the five articles" in Perth Assembly. Next year he was summoned, with other two ministers, before the High Commission; but they answered for themselves so wisely, that they were dismissed with threatenings. He seems to have spent the next eighteen years in Leuchars in comparative peace, storing his mind with useful knowledge, doing good work among his people, and educating young men boarding with him. Many of those in the neighborhood who loved "the good old way" boarded with him. Many of those in the neighborhood who loved "the good old way" resorted to his ministry; and the Presbyterial meetings he attended were precious and refreshing, and helped to unite the faithful ministers. He bought a house and some land, which, with a thousand pounds Scots, he gave as an educational endowment to the parish. To the school of his native parish he bequeathed two thousand marks.

Instigated by Laud, Charles I. sent down to Scotland in 1636 a book of ecclesiastical canons and a book of ordination, which were followed by the Book of Common Prayer for the Church of Scotland. The arbitrary manner in which it was sought to impose these on the Scottish Church was perhaps even more offensive than their matter. Most of the bishops raised letters of horning, charging the ministers in their diocese to buy two copies of the Book of Common Prayer for the use of their parishes within fifteen days; but the ministers supplicated the Privy Council to suspend the charge. Henderson's petition was much esteemed by the people. Soon the body of the nation was embarked in the cause; and four committees were appointed to represent the noblemen, gentlemen, burgesses, and ministers. These committees, each of which contained four members, were called "The Tables," and met in the Parliament House. On their meetings being prohibited by royal proclamation, they resolved to renew the National Covenant. Henderson wrote the bond, adapting it to the time; and Warriston prepared the portion known as "the legal warrant." On the 28th of February, 1638, it was
HENDERSON.

HENDERSON.

sworn and subscribed by thousands in the Greyfriars Church and Churchyard, Edinburgh. This was a day, as Henderson in a letter to the East Kirk, and the same year gave "willingly and of his own accord a thousand pounds Scots for perfecting the house appointed for the library" of St. Andrew's university. As he was anxious to reconcile the king and the English Parliament, he was sent with the Scotch commissioners to Oxford. There he perceived that there was no hope of accommodation consistent with the liberties of England. On his return he had a conference with Montrose, and, seeing that he was determined to support the king, cautioned his friends against him. He was moderator of the General Assembly in 1643, when commissioners were present from the English Parliament; and he drafted the Solemn League and Covenant, which was cordially adopted by the Assembly and Convention of Estates. The assembly renewed the commission's appointment of members to assist at the Westminster Assembly.

Henderson accordingly sailed from Leith for London on the 28th of August, 1643. He addressed the English House of Commons and the Westminster Assembly, when met in St. Margaret's Church to swear the Solemn League and Covenant on the 25th of September. He was of great service in Westminster Assembly, and often took a leading part in its debates. Early in 1645 he was appointed to assist the commissioners of both Parliaments in their treaty with the king at Uxbridge. On this treaty being broken off without success, he returned to his duties at Westminster, though his health was now failing him. In the spring of 1646 the king threw himself into the Scottish army, who retired with him to Newcastle. The Independents were now supreme in the English army, which had crushed his forces; and his only hope lay in speedily coming to terms with the Presbyterians. He sent for Henderson as the fittest man to remove the difficulties of his mind. Though unfit for the journey, he complied, and reached Newcastle in May. But he soon found that there was little hope of Charles agreeing to abolish prelacy in England. It was arranged that the conscientious scruples of Charles should be discussed in a series of papers between him and Henderson. Of these there are eight, five being by the king. Henderson prepared four; but, perhaps to let the king have the last word, only three have been printed. The object of Charles seems to have been to gain time; and, as the discussion lasted fully six weeks, he was not altogether unsuccessful. As Henderson's health had grown much worse, he returned to Scotland, arriving in Edinburgh on the 11th of August, sick and exhausted. To Sir James Stewart, provost of Edinburgh, he said, "I am near the end of my race: in a few days I am going home, and I am as glad of it as a schoolboy when sent home from the school to his father's house." Eight days after his arrival he entered into his rest. When dying, he opened his eyes, and looked up with a pleasant smile. The company were amazed, for his eyes shone and sparkled like stars; and immediately he expired. He was undoubtedly, after Knox, the greatest of Scottish ecclesiastics, and has been held in universal honor as a statesman, and in universal respect as an orator. His piety was secure for the university of that city, and probably he helped to secure for the university of St. Andrew's a grant of a thousand pounds per annum from the revenues of the archbishopric. In January, 1642, he was translated to the East Kirk, and the same year gave "willingly and of his own accord a thousand pounds Scots for perfecting the house appointed for the library" of St. Andrew's university.
HENDERSON.

HENGSTENBERG.

HENGSTENBERG, Ernst Wilhelm, a distinguished German theologian; b. Oct. 20, 1802, at Frankenberg, where his father was pastor of the Young Ladies' Institute; d. in Berlin, May 28, 1869. He was of delicate constitution, and educated in his father's house till 1819, when he entered the University of Bonn. He there devoted himself more particularly to the study of Aristotle under Brandis, and Arabic under Freytag. Fruits of these studies were an edition of the Arabic Moallakah of Amru'l Kais (Amrulka Moallakah cum scholiis, etc.), Bonn, 1823, which won the prize in philosophy, and a German translation of Aristotle's Metaphysics, Bonn, 1824. Lack of means preventing him from carrying out a desire to sit under Neander and Tholuck, he went to Basel in the capacity of tutor to J. J. Stähelin, afterwards professor of Oriental languages at the University of Basel. The death of his mother, and the comfort which he received from the Scripture in his bodily sufferings and mental gloom, awoke in him a strong faith in including Denmark, Sweden, and portions of the Empire of Russia, Iceland and Finland, where, for various reasons, Christianity, or at all events the Bible, had almost ceased to exist, especially engaged his attention. His linguistic powers were of great use to him in his work, both in the publication of new versions of the Bible, and also in his translation of the Gospels, among men whose languages were scarcely known, even by name, outside their own territories.

Mr. Henderson was led, chiefly by family reasons, to return to England in the year 1823, from which time he exchanged directly missionary labor for the not less important duty of training missionaries for the same work in which he had himself so long engaged, and in which he never ceased to take a lively interest. Thirty years of usefulness in academic labors at home followed his twenty years of foreign service. His first home employment was the theological tutorship in the seminary for the training of missionaries at Hoxton, which he held for five years with much acceptance. In 1830 he was appointed to the theological lectureship at Highbury. In 1850 he practically retired from public life, though still discharging occasional duties in connection with his profession as a minister of the gospel, till his powers failed him, and the end came. In addition to a number of popular reprints which appeared under his editorship, the works of Mr. Henderson (who in 1840 had received the degree of D.D. from the University of Copenhagen) comprise the following: Translation of Ross on the Prophecies of Daniel, Edin., 1811; Two Dissertations on Hans Mikkelsen's (Danish) Translation of the New Testament, Copenhagen, 1813; Iceland, or the Journal of a Residence in That Isle in 1814, 1815, Edin., 1819; Biblical Researches, and Travels in Russia, Laid., 1826; The Great Mystery of Godliness, 1813; An Appeal to the Members of the British and Foreign Bible Society, 1824; The Turkish New Testament Incapable of Defence, 1825; Divine Inspiration, 1888; Translation of Isaiah, with Commentary, 1840; Translation of Ezekiel, 1853; it was not in connection with that disannulling body, but with the communion which numbered among its members James and Robert Haldane,—names well known in the religious annals of Scotland in the beginning of the nineteenth century,—that young Henderson received those decided religious impressions which led to his choice of the ministry as a profession; and it was in the seminary in Edinburgh, instituted and supported by one of these brothers, that he received his theological training. The course extended over only two years, and appears to have been in every way inadequate. Before he had completed his studies at this theological seminary, his future work was determined; and in the year 1806 he left Scotland in company with the Rev. John Patterson, with whom he continued to be associated in missionary labor and in friendship for a great part of his life. His original destination was the East Indies; but difficulties connected with the then existing policy of the East India Company led Mr. Henderson, who with his colleague Mr. Patterson had gone to Denmark with the view of a passage to India in a Danish ship, to alter his plans, and confine his future labors to the northern countries of Europe, ...
the gospel, and determined him to study theology, an intention which he once had had, but subsequently, at least in part, relinquished. He belonged to the Reformed Church; but, finding in the Augsburg Confession the best expression of his own views, he united with the Lutheran Church.

In 1824 he was teaching as privat-dozent at the University of Berlin. From the very start he advocated the truth of the Old and New Testaments, and entered a protest against rationalism, especially in its attitude toward the Old Testament. These views brought him into disfavor with the ministry of worship, which endeavored, in vain, to tempt him away from Berlin with offers of extraordinary professorships at Königsberg (1826) and Bonn (1828). In 1828 he became ordinary professor in Berlin; and his influence for nearly half a century over his students, as teacher and adviser, was exceeded only by that of Tholuck. Hengstenberg in 1829, and his home life was very pleasant; but all his children and his wife preceded him to the grave.

In 1827 Hengstenberg became editor of the Evangelische Kirchen-Zeitung ("Evangel Church Journal"), through which he perhaps exerted even greater influence upon the theology and religious opinion of the age than through his critical and exegetical works. The plan of this journal was conceived by Le Coq, who communicated it to the brothers Von Gerlach. They selected Hengstenberg for editor; and for forty-two years he continued to edit the paper in the interest of evangelical truth, with fearless daring, and undaunted by the attacks of critics. Hardly a man of the century has been the object of so much bitter opposition and vituperation as he. He was accused of pietism, dead orthodoxy, fanaticism, Jesuitism, on the one hand, and of demagogism and servility to the State on the other. The main foe against which the paper contended was rationalism, "the born and sworn enemy of Christ and his Church." Without fear it continued to publish spiritualizing too far, there can be no doubt, as Kahnis has said, that the work contributed largely to revive the recognition of the divine revelation of the Old Testament.


HENHÖFER, Alois, b. at Völkersbach, Baden, July 11, 1789; d. at Spök, near Carlsruhe, Dec. 5, 1862; was educated in the school of Rashatt; studied in the university of Freiburg and the seminary of Meersburg; received the lower orders by Dalberg, the higher by Hohenlohe; and was appointed pastor at Mühlhausen in 1818. Suspected of heresy, he was tried, convicted, and excommunicated from the Roman-Catholic Church in 1822; but the larger part of his congregation entered with him the evangelical church; and in 1823 he was appointed minister at Spök, where he labored for the rest of his life with great effect. Of his numerous works, polemical against Romanism and rationalism, the principal are Christliches Glaubensbekennniss und Der Kampf des Unglaublichs mit Aberglauben und Glauben. His life was written by K. F. Ledderhoze (Heidelberg, 1863) and by E. Frommel (Karlsruhe, 1865).

HENKE, Heinrich Philipp Konrad, b. at Hehlen in Brunswick, July 3, 1752; d. at Helmstedt, May 2, 1806; studied at Helmstedt; and was appointed professor there in 1777 and in theology (1780). He was a pupil and representative of the rationalism of his time; and even his best work (Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Kirche, Brunswick, 1790-1808, 6 vols.)
HENOTIKON.

HENRY IV. See HENRY OF CLUNY.

HENRY OF CLUNY was born in Switzerland or Italy towards the close of the eleventh century, and became a monk at Cluny, where he held the dignity of subabbot, put off the cowl, and began, starting from Lausanne, to wander from place to place, bare-footed, carrying a cross in his hands, and preaching penitence, with singular effect. In 1116 he came to Mans, and was received with enthusiasm. But his attacks on the corruption of the Church and the depravity of the clergy caused a tremendous popular excitement; and Bishop Hildebert drew him away. For some time he wandered together with Peter of Bruys, whose heretical opinions, however, he did not share. But Peter was burnt at the stake; and in 1184 Henry was arrested by the Bishop of Arles, and brought before the Council of Plais. The result of his trial are not known; but he was soon set free, and repaired to Southern France, where he continued his reformatory labor with great success. Whole congregations left their churches, and joined him; and in 1148 Pope Eugene III. sent Bernard of Clairvaux to Toulouse, to preach against him. He was again arrested, and condemned to lifelong imprisonment, but seems to have died shortly after. About his doctrines, only very little is found in the Acta Episcoporum Conciliorum, by the Abbé Mabillon: Veitigerum Analectorum, T. I. 1747. — DIBELIUS.

HENRY OF ZUTPHEN. See MOLLER.

HENRY IV., king of France (1589—1610), was b. at Pau, in Béarn, Dec. 15, 1553; a son of Antoine de Bourbon-Vendôme and Jeanne d’Albret, Queen of Navarre, and was educated in the Reformed faith, and solemnly entered the Church, took the lead of the Huguenot party; and then followed a long series of inextinguishable intrigues, violent feuds, and regular campaigns, until at the death of Henry III. (in 1589), he seemed to have become entirely the acknowledged head of the Huguenot party in France, not only on account of his big rank, but also on account of his brilliant military talent. On the death of his mother he ascended the throne of Navarre (1572), and in the same year he married Marguerite of Valois. But he escaped from the Massacre of St. Bartholomew only by abjuring his faith; and, during the three next years which he spent at the court of Catherine of Medicis, he seemed to have become entirely lost to the Protestant cause. Suddenly, however, he left the court (1578), re-entered the Calvinist Church, took the lead of the Huguenot party; and then followed a long series of inextricable intrigues, violent feuds, and regular campaigns, until at the death of Henry III. (in 1589), he found himself, according to the Salic law, the legitimate heir of the French crown. In order to gain the Roman Catholics, who formed the great majority of his subjects, he abjured a second time the Reformed faith, and solemnly re-entered the Roman Church, July 23, 1593. In order to satisfy the Protestants, his old friends and com
rades, he signed the Edict of Nantes April 15, 1688; and from that time he reigned in peace and with great success.

The conversion of Henry IV. was sincere, it is impossible to believe; he was one of the clearest heads of his age, and he was educated a Protestant. It was simply a political measure, an act of shrewdness, a stage-trick set in scene with all the circumstantiality which the intended effect demanded. More than once he confessed, with his usual incurable open-mouthedness, that he had joined Rome only to make sure of the French crown. But, even if his words had been silent, his acts would have told the truth. His internal policy was conciliatory, tolerably impartial, though rather in favor of the Roman Catholics. But his foreign policy was from the first to the last moment, in its highest aims and in its smallest details, so invariably, so steadily, so decidedly, set against Rome, Spain, the Catholic League in Germany, and for England, the Netherlands, the Protestant Union of Germany, that it soon became evident to the opposite party that there was only one means of preventing France from placing herself at the head of Protestant Europe against the Pope; namely, the death of the king. Consequently he was assassinated in his carriage in the streets of Paris, May 14, 1610, by Francis Ravaillac, a former Jesuit.

Henry VIII. See England.

HENRY VIII. OF ENGLAND. See England.

HENRY VIII. OF ENGLAND. See England.

HENSCHEN, Gottfried, the associate of Bolland in the preparation of the famous Acta Sanctorum; b. at Venard, in Flanders, Jan. 21, 1600; d. at

HERACLAS, Bishop of Alexandria (232–247); was a Pagan by birth; studied philosophy under Ammonius Saccas; was converted to Christianity by Origen, whom he succeeded as director of the catechetical school. His stand-point was probably identical with that of Origen; but he was adroit enough to avoid giving offence, and after the death of Demetrius he was chosen bishop. He left no literary monuments.

HERACLEON. See Gnosticism.

HERBERGER, Valerius, b. at Fraustadt, Prussian Poland, April 21, 1562; d. there May 18, 1627; was school-teacher in his native city since 1584, and pastor of the evangelical church since 1598, and acquired a great name as a preacher. He published several collections of sermons, and his Postille is still read. See S. F. Lauterbach: Vita, Fama et Fato V. H., 1708.

HERBELOT, Barthélemy d', Orientalist; b. in Paris, Dec. 4, 1623; d. there Dec. 8, 1695. His life was devoted to the composition of his invaluable thesaurus of Oriental learning. — Bibliothèque orientale, ou dictionnaire universal contenant généralement tout ce qui regarde la connaissance de peuples de l'Orient, edited by A. Galland, Paris, 1697. It is mainly an abridged translation of the immense biographical and bibliographical dictionary of Haji Khalfa, but enlarged from various sources. In spite of its occasional inaccuracies and inconsistencies, it is “the one available source for much information to others than Oriental scholars; and as such it retains its importance.” It was reprinted in Maastricht, 1776, and, with additions by Galand, The Hague, 1777–79, 4 vols.; reprinted in Maastricht, 1780; German translation, Halle, 1785–90, 4 vols.

HERBERT, Edward. See DEISM.

HERBERT, George, one of the quaintest but holiest poets of England; b. at Montgomery, Wales, April 3, 1593; d. at Bemerton, Eng., February, 1633. He was a fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge (1610), and public orator of the university (1619–27), in which capacity he came in contact with King James, and was for a time more or less a courtier; but in 1625 he took holy orders, and was in 1630 made rector of his native parish. He was so placid and so devoted, that he was called “Holy George Herbert.” His fame rests upon his poems, The Temple, Sacred Poems and Private Ejaculations, Cambridge, 1631. They abound in oddities of expression, but breathe so pure and holy a spirit that they are religious classics, and give Herbert claim to be, with Keble, the poet of Anglican theology. Herbert’s prose-work, The Priest to the Temple, or the Character of a Country Parson, is an excellent treatise upon pastoral theology. It has doubtless helped Herbert’s reputation that Isaac Walton was his biographer (1760). There are many editions of Herbert. Perhaps the best is that by Professor Nichol, London, 1803. Coleridge edited his complete works, London, 1846.

HERDER, Johann Gottfried, b. Aug. 25, 1744, at Mohrungen, East Prussia; d. at Weimar, Dec. 18, 1803; studied philosophy, languages, and literature, at Königsberg, where he acquired the friendship of Kant and Hamann, and in 1764 appointed teacher in the cathedral-school of Riga, and in 1767 afternoon-preacher in one of the suburban churches. In Riga he first distinguished himself as a pulpit-orator, drawing larger and larger audiences; and at the same time he also attracted the attention of literary Germany by his Fragmente über die deutsche Literatur and Krätische Wälder. In 1779 he left Riga, accompanied the Prince of Holstein-Gottorp for some time, made in Strassburg the acquaintance of Goethe and Jung-Stilling, and was in 1771 appointed court-preacher and superintendent at Bückeburg. To this period of his life belong, of his theological writings, the Provinzialblätter, Älteste Urkunde des Menschengeschlechts, Erläuterungen aus einer neueröffneten morgenländischen Quelle, and Briefe zweier Brüder Jesu, which made a deep impression, and established the axioms in biblical exegesis, that the Bible is not simply a doctrinal code, a dogmatical system, but a whole literature, which must be viewed in the light of its time, its place, and its historical surroundings, in order to be fully understood. In 1776 he moved to Weimar, where he was court-preacher and superintendent-general, and there published...
The ripest and most important of his works, philosophical as well as theological. To the former class belong his Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte, Got; to the latter, his Lieder der Liebe (1779), half a paraphrase of half a commentary on the Canticles. From these Herder's Poesie (1782), which remodelled the whole conception, popular and scientific, of Hebrew poetry, and especially his so-called Christliche Schriften, which gave the first impulse to that immense literature generally known under the name of The Life of Christ. Not belonging to any special theological school, Herder formed no school himself; but, by his wide historical horizon and vivid psychological intuition, he exercised an elevating and ennobling influence on almost all departments of theological science and Christian life. Of the common edition of his collected works, his theological writings occupy the first twelve volumes.


HEREFORD, an English bishops, the cathedral of which is situated in the town of this name. The see was detached from Lichfield in 673. Hereford is situated on the left bank of the Wye, has a population of nineteen thousand. The cathedral was founded 825, rebuilt 1030, burnt by the Welsh 1055, again rebuilt 1079-1115: the great western tower fell 1786. There have been two modern restorations,—1842 and 1863. The cathedral is three hundred and forty-two feet long. "But for the fall of the western tower, the consequent curtailment of the nave, and other solemnis, few cathedrals could offer so complete a field of progressive architecture, from Early Norman to latest Perpendicular." The present (1882) incumbent of the see of Hereford is John Atlay, D.D., and the income is forty-two hundred pounds.

Hereford, "a selection") designates in the New Testament a party or school; and the Pharisees (Acts v. 5, xxvi. 5), the Sadducees (Acts v. 1), and even the Christians (Acts xxiv. 14, xxviii. 2), are called "heresiies." The use of the term, however, in connection with schisms, proves that it did not exclusively designate dissent in matters of doctrine (1 Cor. xi. 19; Gal. v. 20). At a later period the term was employed principally in the sense of doctrinal departures from revealed truth, or erroneous views (Tit. iii. 10; 2 Pet. ii. 1).

The apostles treated very seriously all departures from their doctrine. We need only think of such expressions as "grievous wolves" (Acts xx. 29), "dogs" (Phil. iii. 2), and the terms in which Paul speaks of the Judaizing teachers in the Galatian Church, and of the Gnostic teachers referred to in the Epistle to the Colossians and the Pastoral Letters. With no less severity did the fathers of the first three centuries treat departures from the catholic doctrine. Polycarp regarded Marcion as the first-born of the Devil. Ignatius sees in heretics poisonous plants, or animals in human form. Justin and Tertullian condemn their errors as inscriptions of the Evil One; Theophilus compares them to barren and rocky islands on which ships are wrecked; and Origen says, that as pirates place lights on cliffs to allure and destroy vessels in quest of refuge, so the Prince of this world lights the fires of false knowledge in order to destroy men. [Jerome calls the congregations of the heretics synagogues of Satan (Ep. 123), and says their communion is to be avoided like that of vipers and scorpions (Ep. 180). They included under heresy all dissent from the fundamental doctrines of salvation, attributed it to insubordination to the apostolic faith, and regarded pride and ambition as its ultimate causes.

The apostles and fathers could not have tolerated all possible construction of its doctrine without being guilty of treason toward the Church of Christ. The same is true, in a smaller measure, of the Reformation period. Luther could not have tolerated the Zwinglian view of the Lord's Supper without doing violence to his own convictions of the meaning of Scripture [?]. But, while the fathers were justified in insisting upon the fundamental truths of Christianity, it ought not to be overlooked that they knew how to distinguish between doctrines subversive of Christianity (such as Ebionism, Gnosticism, and Manichæism) and dissent in unessentials (as in the case of the Montanists, Novatians, Donatists, etc.). The baptism of Novatians, Donatists, Arians, etc., was recognized as valid (Augustine, De Bapt., I. 13, etc.). Heresy disturbed the unity of doctrine and of fellowship in the early Church. The Church was, therefore, forced to exclude heretics from its communion. Once excluded, they formed societies of their own. This was the case with the Novatians, Gnostics, Manichæans, Donatists, Nestorians, etc. But, relatively justified as the Donatists and others were, all these heretical organizations lacked vital power, and soon succumbed to disintegration, or dragged out a lingering existence. On the other hand, the Church was represented by such figures as "the pillar of truth," "the body of Christ." "No one can have God as a father, who does not accept the Church as his mother," says Cyprian; or "Christ for head, who does not belong to the Church as the body," says Augustine. Notwithstanding this sharp distinction, Augustine and the early Church generally regarded only such false doctrine heresy which is persistent, and prompted by animosity to the Church (pertinacia animosula).

In the middle ages the Latin Church pronounced the Eastern Church schismatic, and itself the catholic or universal Church. The procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son (Pilulae), adopted as a doctrine at the Fourth Lateran Council (1215), has never been accepted by the Eastern Communion. But the Latin Church has never pronounced the Greek doctrine heretical. The dualistic errors of the Cathari, however, it did; and, when the Reformation came, it pursued the new sects with fire and sword. If the visible Church be the body of those who confess Christ, then the Latin, Eastern, and Protestant churches are parts of one Church. The Latin Church, however, appropriating to itself the appellation "catholic," calls the Greeks "schismatics," and the Protestants "heretics." If it be the Church, then the congregations outside of
its pale do not belong to the Church, or participate in salvation; for the Church is the channel of salvation. Roman-Catholic theologians have avoided this conclusion by distinguishing between two kinds of heretics,—material heretics, or those who hold to error in ignorance, and are free from guilt, and formal heretics, or those who willingly and resolutely put themselves in antagonism to the Church (Perrone, Praelectiones, § 265). The Protestant Church does not pretend to be the Church, but only a part of it. Its confessions never declared either the Roman or the Eastern Church heretical, nor did the Lutheran Church call the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper a heresy.

What, then, is the fundamental idea of heresy? Heresy is erroneous doctrine which has grown up in the Church, but denies its essential teachings as they were formulated by early Christianity. If that which is peculiar to and essential in Christianity is the confession in the Apostles' Creed of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,—three persons in a unity of essence,—then Trinitism, Ebionism, Monarchism, and Arianism are heresies. If Christ is the God-Man, then Docetists, Samosaites, Monophysites, and Nestorians are heretics; and if it be the office of the Holy Spirit alone to apply the benefits of redemption, and to regenerate, then the Pelagians belong in the same category.

Among the mistakes of the visible Church, which for many centuries disturbed the spiritual vision of Christians, and led to horrible crimes in the name of religion, must be counted the delusion that heresy ought to be punished by the civil power. While Luther raised his voice in indignation at the blood of the first heretic, he continued to the close. He was a generous-minded Puritan and Presbyterian, with an irenic spirit, and took an active part in the organization of the Provincial Assembly of Lancashire, and in providing a learned and faithful ministry for the churches, and excluding the scandalous and ignorant, for which he received much ill-deserved reproach. His principal works are of a practical character: Contemplations and Devotions, pp. 546, London, 1681; Independency on Scriptures of the Independency of the Churches, 4to, pp. 44, London, 1683 (irreric towards the Independents); Wisdom's Tripos, London, 1685, in which he shows the excellency of Christian wisdom above that of worldly policy and moral prudence. He also delivered several sermons before Parliament, of which we would mention A Pair of Compasses for Church and State, November, 1642, and David's Song, June, 1643. For further information see Wood: Athenae Oxoniensia, III. 477; and Krid: Memoirs of Westminster Divines, Paisley, 1811.

HERMAN, Nicolaus, one of the earliest evangelical hymn-writers; was cantor at Joachimsthal in Bohemia, and died there May 3, 1561. His hymns, intended for the school and the home, rather than for the church, appeared originally in fly-leaves, and then in two collections, 1560 and 1562. Some of them are still in use. His "Mine hour appointed is at hand," was translated by Massie, and was sung at the funeral of Prince Albert in 1861. His life was written by...
HERMANN.

K. F. Ledderhose, Halle, 1855, and by E. Pfeifer, Berlin, 1858.

HERMANN or HERMANN CONTRACTUS (the lame), b., of noble descent, July 18, 1013; entered Lake Constance, took the vows when he was thirty; and d. in 1054. He was a man of vast learning and varied authorship; but his principal work is his chronicle, from the birth of Christ till 1054, and specially valuable for the time of Henry III. It was first printed at Basel, 1529, afterwards. See PERTZ: Monum., V.; HANS JACOB: Herman der Lahme, Mainz, 1875.

HERMANN OF FRITZLAR, a mystic from the middle of the fourteenth century; was probably a rich layman, who, after travelling in France, Italy, and Germany, retired from the world, and devoted himself to study and authorship. His Die Blume der Schauung is lost; but his Heiligenleiben, a compilation from sources now mostly lost, is printed in PFEIFFER: Deutsche Mystiker d. 14. Jahrhunderts, I.

HERMANN VON DER HARDT, b. at Melle, Westphalia, Nov. 15, 1660; d. at Helmstadt, Feb. 28, 1746; studied at Jena; became in 1686 a member of the Collegium Philobiblicum in Leipzig; staid for some time in Dresden in the house of Spenner; and was in 1690 appointed professor of Oriental languages at Helmstadt. There he wrote his Iichen, a compilation from sources now mostly lost, is printed in PFEIFFER: Deutsche Mystiker d. 14. Jahrhunderts, I.

HERMANN VON WIED, or HERMANN V., b. Jan. 15, 1477; d. Aug. 15, 1552; was elected Archbishop of Cologne by the chapter in 1515, and confirmed by Leo X. In 1536 he convened a provincial synod, and introduced a number of reforms in his diocese, though without causing any conflict with Rome. But in 1542 he invited Butzer from Strassburg to preach the Reformed gospel in the cathedral of Bonn; and at once began the attacks of the Roman curia and the opposition of his own chapter. When the contest became acrimonious, the emperor, Charles V., stepped in; and, as the Protestant princes were unwilling to interfere, the archbishop was deposed, and retired to his estates at Wied. See C. VARNHTRAPP: Hermann v. Wied u. sein Reformationssuch in Köln, Leipzig, 1878.

HERMAS [*the Pilgrim's Progress of the Church of the second century,* Dean Stanley], a name given by a "book of rebuking evil," the Church, called the Shepherd (pastor, rathilv), and held in high esteem by the early Church [quoted by Ireneus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, etc.]. The title Shepherd evidently was derived from the first words of the angel to the author, "I am the shepherd" (Ewv ept s rathilv).

Text.—We are now in possession of two Greek copies,—the one in the Sinaitic manuscript, discovered 1859 (not complete); the other in the Leipsic manuscript, together with three pages found on Mount Athos. Editions appeared at Leipzig by Rud. Anger (1846), by Th. and J. Butzer (1856, 1863), DRESEL (1863), HILGENFELD (1860), [2d ed. 1881]. There are two Latin translations,—the Vulgata and the Palatina (in the Vatican Library). The Vulgata was first edited by Faber Stapulensis, Paris, 1513; since then many times. Hilgenfeld's edition (Leipzig, 1875) is critical. D'Abbadie issued an Ethiopic translation, Leipzig, 1890. Its probable date is 543. The edition of Gebhardt and Harnack (Patres Apost., Leipzig, 1877), based upon the Sinaitic manuscript, is the best.

Contents.—The book contains a number of visions accorded to Hermas. Their intent is to arouse Hermas, and the Church through him, to repentance. The time of repentance is limited, and will soon be at an end. The uniformity of style stamps the whole as one composition. The author divides the book into two parts; an aged woman explaining the visions of the first part, an angel those of the second. The visions contain revelations, commandments (to believe in the one God, practise alms, avoid falsehood and fornication, etc.), and similitudes. Hermas was neither a Judaizing Christian (Schwegler, Lipsius), nor an intense Paulinian, but a member of the orthodox church of his day.

Authorship.—The opinions may be reduced to four: (1) Relying upon the testimony of the Muratorian canon, a real Hermas, the brother of Bishop Pius (139—154), was author (Heyne, Gebhardt, Harnack); (2) Relying upon the statement in the book itself (Vis. II. 4, 3), that Hermas delivered the book to Clement, assumed to be Clement of Rome, the author is regarded as having been his contemporary (Gaab, Caspari, Alzog, Zahn); (3) Hermas wrote his book under Pius, but gave himself out for a contemporary of Clement, or for the Hermas of Rom. xvi. 14 (Behm, Ewald, Credner, Ritschi, Hefele, Dorner, Behrsch); (4) an unknown author of the second century who simulated the old Hermas (Schwegler, Lechler, Hilgenfeld, Lange, Donaldson). We hold to the first view, on the ground of the explicit statement in the Muratorian canon. The Clement referred to in the book is not necessarily Clement of Rome. The condition of the Church represented is that of the first half of the second century, with its Gnostic errors and its hypocrites. The work was probably written about 130, for we are not shut up to the period between 139—154, which, according to Lipsius, was the term of Pius' administration. Pius was not bishop in our sense, but a prominent presbyter. The book of Hermas speaks only of presbyters in the Roman Church (comp. Vis. II. 2, 6; III. 8, etc.).

HERMENEUTICS. Biblical. I. DEFINITION.

-The term "hermeneutics" is derived from ἱερομαι (from ἴερος, the messenger of the gods), and allied with τιω ("to inquire"), and has the broader meaning of explaining the thoughts of another (Xen., Mem., I. 2, 52; Thuc., II. 69), and the narrower meaning of translation (John i. 38, etc.). Hermeneutics differs from exegesis as the theory differs from practice, and has for its object the definition of the laws by which the meaning of the Scriptures is to be ascertained and communicated. Augustine spoke long ago of two qualifications of an interpreter of Scripture,—the capacity to find out the author's meaning, and the capacity to express it ("Mōdis inveniendi quae intelligenda sunt et modus proferendi, quae intellecta sunt."—De Doct. Chr., I. 1); and Ernesti speaks in the same way ("Subtilias intelligendi et explicandi").

II. PLACE.—There was an exegesis of the Bible before there was a science of exegesis; and hermeneutics cannot make an exegete, any more than homiletics can make a preacher, or rhetoric an orator. Notwithstanding this, however, hermeneutics has its own place, and trains up the natural talent, and lays down laws for its exercise. "The same considerations," as Landerer has said, "which make theology, or the science of the true religion, necessary, make also hermeneutics necessary as a special theological discipline." It is a branch of historical theology, or more especially of exegetical theology, which investigates the historical origin of Christianity, and expounds its records. It regards the canon as fixed, and rests upon the shoulders of the science of biblical introduction, as well as upon those of biblical criticism, which is concerned with the integrity of the text. But on the other side, without the aid of hermeneutics, the occasion of the biblical writings and their design cannot be fully known; and even textual criticism depends to some extent upon the exposition of the text. The relation of hermeneutics, therefore, and biblical criticism and introduction, is one of mutual dependence.

III. METHOD.—The method which hermeneutics pursues is twofold,—the ascertainment of the meaning of Scripture, and its communication. The ascertainment of the author's thoughts is conditioned upon the accurate study of the language in which he has clothed them. The laws of grammar are to be strictly followed, and all the results of lexicographical learning to be applied. But it must not be forgotten that the man himself is the style, and that the thoughts of the author regulate the language; so that the letter of the grammar is by no means an infallible guide. In the interpretation of the Psalms and the Epistle to the Philippians, for example, it is necessary that the mood of the writer, and his peculiar environments, should be taken into consideration. Schleiermacher well says, "No bibli cal book can be perfectly understood, except as it is studied with reference to the whole environment out of which it grew, and in connection with the position of author and readers" (Kurze Doctr., § 140). On this particular point, there is also a subjective qualification; namely, that the interpreter is able to enter into the thoughts of the author, and is willing to do it. Experience teaches that only kindred souls can understand each other; or, as Luther says, "He only understands Virgil's Eclogues who has lived with the shepherds; and he who will understand a poet must travel to the poet's country." The interpreter must have religious feeling, but under no circumstances approach his work with dogmatic prepossessions. Bengel says, "A living faith is the first qualification of an authentic interpreter;" and Landerer says, "The interpreter must be led by the spirit of truth which rules in the Bible." Absolute freedom from prepossessions is as impossible as it is uncalled for. Indifferent to the truth of the Scripture he can not and ought not to be.

The communication of the meaning of the biblical writer may be effected in three ways,—by simple translation, by paraphrase, and by commentary. Paraphrases have their justification in the pregnancy and fulness of Scripture. As for the commentator, he should not merely give grammatical criticisms, but give a clear insight into the organism and aim of the book upon which he is commenting.

IV. PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION.—Departures from the true method of interpretation result from a failure to appreciate all the requirements of the exegete, and from a purpose, voluntary or involuntary, to put into the author's words a meaning which is not there. The first in point of historical origin is the allegorical method. The word comes from ἀλληγορία, which means to say something else than is expressed in the language. The allegorist therefore seeks to uncover a meaning which is not apparent on the surface; the presumption being, that the Spirit has concealed a sense behind the words, of which the human writers were not even conscious. According to this principle, there is a simple meaning, but also another, which the interpreter is to detect. This method was carried to ridiculous extremes in the ancient church and during the middle ages; and Luther says, "When I was a monk, I allegorized everything; but now I have given up allegorizing, and my first and best art is to explain the Scriptures according to the simple sense (simplici sensu); for it is in the literal sense that power, doctrine, and art reside." The second method is the dogmatic, which decides the rules of dogmatic prepossessions in the allegorical. The interpreter approaches the Bible with a rule of faith which is the norm of interpretation. In a special sense is this true of Roman-Catholic interpreters, who may not depart from the ecclesiastical tradition and the decrees of councils. Lohns well expresses it, when he says (p. 151), "As a diplomat must explain and look at everything in the spirit, and with an eye to the interest, of his prince . . . so must the Catholic expositor follow the instructions, and interpret in the spirit, of the Catholic Church." Interpretation is thus made in a true sense of the word imposition of interpretation. In a special sense is this true of Roman-Catholic interpreters, who may not depart from the ecclesiastical tradition and the decrees of councils. Lohns well expresses it, when he says (p. 151), "As a diplomat must explain and look at everything in the spirit, and with an eye to the interest, of his prince . . . so must the Catholic expositor follow the instructions, and interpret in the spirit, of the Catholic Church." Interpretation is thus made in a true sense of the word imposition of interpretation.

The so-called rational method, according to which the interpreter is to approach the Bible with a mind absolutely devoid of prepossessions, did the very thing which its advocates professed to deprecate. The last method is the so-called dogmatic, by which is meant that every special word is emphasized, and, as far as possible, enlarged.

V. HISTORY.—The interpretation of Scripture flourished long before hermeneutics was
Hermeneutics was first treated as a special science in the Lutheran Church by Flacius, in his Clavis Sac. Script. (Basel, 1567), Franz, in his Tract. philol. de interpr. Sac. Script. (Wirt., 1819), and especially by Glassius, Philol. Sacra (Jena, 1629, ed. Buderus, 1727). The intense dogmatism which followed in the Lutheran Church was opposed by the historical method which the Arminian Grotius (d. 1645) pursued in his Annotationes on the whole Bible. But of more influence upon exegesis was the Pietism of the latter part of the seventeenth century, which regarded it more as an exercise of worship than a work of science. Spener (d. 1705) interpreted the New Testament writings under the influence of this theory; but Bengel (d. 1752) followed with the keen and suggestive notes of his Gnomon (Tüb., 1742); and a few years later Ernesti (d. 1781) became the eloquent champion of a strictly philosophical and grammatical exegesis in his Institutio interpretis N. T. (Lips., 1761. 5th ed., 1809, Eng. trans. by Terrot, 1843). Without denying its divine character, he held that the Bible should be interpreted by the same rules as any other book. Semler (d. 1791), on the other hand, advocated the so-called historical method, according to which the interpreter places himself in the environment of the writers. Ernesti's principles were followed by Beck (Monogrammata hern. libr. N. T., Lips., 1803) and Keil (Lehrb. d. Hern. d. N. T., Leip., 1810); Semler's, by Bretschneider (Hist.-dogmat. Ausleg. d. N. T., Leip., 1808), and, to a greater or less extent, by the exegetes of the rationalistic period—Paulus (d. 1851), and others. In this century criticism has seen itself forced by the works of Strauss, and the historical investigations of the Tubingen school, to pursue a strictly historical method. But in the mean time Winer, by his Grammar (Leip., 1822), had laid the "sure foundation of New-Testament exegesis." Thus the exegesis of the last two generations has been built up on a grammatical-historical foundation. See Exegesis and Introduction.

HEROD.
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HERMIAp, the author of a satire on Greek philosophy (κατηγορια των ελληνον φιλοσοφων), written 1803 in the same standpoint, not in history and adroitness, though without scientific interest, and probably belonging to the close of the second or the beginning of the third century. Neither the book nor the author is mentioned in ancient literature. The book was edited by Seiler (Zurich, 1853), Donmerich (Halle, 1704), and Otto in Corpus Hermeticum, vol. IX. (Dela, 1830), with some introductory notes. WAGENMANN.

HERMOGENES, an African heretic, a painter by profession, and probably a resident of Carthage, against whom Tertullian wrote his Adversus Hermogenum, between 180 and 207 (cf. Bonwetsch: Die Schriften Tertullians, Bonn, 1876). His principal tenet, the root of all his errors, was the eternity of matter. He seems to have written books, and he had pupils; but he formed no school. Theodoret, Origen, and Theophilus of Antioch, also wrote against him; but the notices of him found outside of Tertullian are often difficult to reconcile with each other. G. UHLMANN.

HERMON (peak), the present Jebel-esh-Sheikh (the chief mountain), the highest point of Anti-Lebanon, situated forty miles north-east of the Sea of Galilee, and thirty miles south-west of Damascus; rises 9,053 feet above the Mediterranean, and about 11,000 feet above the valley of the Jordan. It consists of three distinct peaks, and is covered with ice and snow all the year round, though in summer time only in the ravines. It formed the north-eastern boundary of Israel (Deut. iii. 8; Josh. xii. 1), and is often mentioned in the Old Testament. In the New Testament it is not mentioned, unless it be the scene of the transfiguration (Matt. xvi.; Mark ix.). In many points it fits the narrative of the Gospels better than Tabor.

HEROD.—[1. The Herodian Family, a family which for a century played a most conspicuous part in Jewish history, and witnessed the birth and career of our Lord. The rise and fall of the Hasmonean dynasty, the progress of the Apostolic Church, came in conflict with, used, intermarried with, and finally exterminated, the one noble Ammonian family (see Maccabees); catered at any cost to the Roman power, and in more than one instance won the warmest friendship of its emperors; ascended the throne of Judea, rebuilt the temple, and gave to the kingdom an external glory and importance which were never excelled, except in the reigns of David and Solomon. It gave birth to men of fine intellects, strong wills, and unusual talent for ruling, — a talent, which, as exhibited in Herod the Great, as has been well said, might, with other environments, have won for him a name amongst the great rulers of nations. But, with these natural endowments of intellect, they combined an unscrupulousness in securing the throne and career of Nazareth, which seldom been equalled in history and adroitness, though without scientific interest, and probably belonging to the close of the second or the beginning of the third century. Neither the book nor the author is mentioned in ancient literature. The book was edited by Seiler (Zurich, 1853), Donmerich (Halle, 1704), and Otto in Corpus Hermeticum, vol. IX. (Dela, 1830), with some introductory notes. WAGENMANN.

THE HERODIAN FAMILY, a family which for a century played a most conspicuous part in Jewish history, and witnessed the birth and career of our Lord. The rise and fall of the Hasmonean dynasty, the progress of the Apostolic Church, came in conflict with, used, intermarried with, and finally exterminated, the one noble Ammonian family (see Maccabees); catered at any cost to the Roman power, and in more than one instance won the warmest friendship of its emperors; ascended the throne of Judea, rebuilt the temple, and gave to the kingdom an external glory and importance which were never excelled, except in the reigns of David and Solomon. It gave birth to men of fine intellects, strong wills, and unusual talent for ruling, — a talent, which, as exhibited in Herod the Great, as has been well said, might, with other environments, have won for him a name amongst the great rulers of nations. But, with these natural endowments of intellect, they combined an unscrupulousness in securing the throne and career of Nazareth, which seldom been equalled in history and adroitness, though without scientific interest, and probably belonging to the close of the second or the beginning of the third century. Neither the book nor the author is mentioned in ancient literature. The book was edited by Seiler (Zurich, 1853), Donmerich (Halle, 1704), and Otto in Corpus Hermeticum, vol. IX. (Dela, 1830), with some introductory notes. WAGENMANN.

THE HERODIAN FAMILY, a family which for a century played a most conspicuous part in Jewish history, and witnessed the birth and career of our Lord. The rise and fall of the Hasmonean dynasty, the progress of the Apostolic Church, came in conflict with, used, intermarried with, and finally exterminated, the one noble Ammonian family (see Maccabees); catered at any cost to the Roman power, and in more than one instance won the warmest friendship of its emperors; ascended the throne of Judea, rebuilt the temple, and gave to the kingdom an external glory and importance which were never excelled, except in the reigns of David and Solomon. It gave birth to men of fine intellects, strong wills, and unusual talent for ruling, — a talent, which, as exhibited in Herod the Great, as has been well said, might, with other environments, have won for him a name amongst the great rulers of nations. But, with these natural endowments of intellect, they combined an unscrupulousness in securing the throne and career of Nazareth, which seldom been equalled in history and adroitness, though without scientific interest, and probably belonging to the close of the second or the beginning of the third century. Neither the book nor the author is mentioned in ancient literature. The book was edited by Seiler (Zurich, 1853), Donmerich (Halle, 1704), and Otto in Corpus Hermeticum, vol. IX. (Dela, 1830), with some introductory notes. WAGENMANN.
Idumean (Joseph., Antiq., XIV. 1, 3), who was made governor (σταραγάς) of Idumea by Alexander Janneus (d. 78). He was succeeded in this position by his son Antipater (d. 43), the father of Herod the Great. He was an ambitious man, and saw in the weak will of the Asmonean prince, Hyrcanus II., growing melancholy for his plans. When the latter was forced by his brother Aristobulus (in 69) to renounce his royal claims and high priestly office, Antipater's artifice succeeded in inducing him to escape from Jerusalem, and assert his rights. The close friendship between them continued. They together espoused Pompey's cause (64 B.C.), and, after the battle of Pharsalus, Caesar's (48 B.C.). Caesar rewarded both, confirmed Hyrcanus in the high priesthood, but made the wily Idumean procurator of Judea (47). The object of his ambition was probably gratified. It remained for his son to win the name and dignities of the royal office.

2. **Herod the Great**, king of Judea from 37 to 4 B.C.; of Idumean descent, and second son of Antipater. He was a man of restless ambition, strong will, and keen intellect, but cruel and unscrupulous. When, in 47 B.C., Antipater was rewarded for his services to Caesar with Roman citizenship and the procuratorship of Judæa, Herod, who was then twenty-five (the ναυτικός ἄνδρας of Josephus, Antiq., XIV. 9, 2 is probably a mistake of the copyist), was intrusted with the government of Galilee, and soon afterwards with the procuratorship of Cælesyria. He soon displayed his ability by ridding the territory of dangerous bands of robbers, and winning, by a rapid collection of tribute-money, the favor of Cassius (after Caesar's assassination 44 B.C.). In order to secure the confidence of his Jewish subjects, he put away his wife Doris, and married Mariamne, the grand-daughter of the high priest Hyrcanus. In 41 B.C. he was appointed tetrarch by Anthony, whose favor he had purchased with rich gifts. Forced the following year, by an irruption of the Parthians, to abandon Jerusalem, he fled to Rome. By a generous use of money he secured the favor of Anthony and Augustus, and through their influence rose rapidly in high office. This, however, did not relieve him of the necessity of winning his kingdom by arms. After defeating Antigonus, the Asmonean king of Judea, in a pitched battle in Galilee, he besieged Jerusalem, and took it in 37 B.C.

Herod's reign divides itself into three periods. During the first period, stretching from 37 to 28 B.C., he firmly establishes his throne; the second, from 28 to 14 B.C., is marked by a brilliant patronage of architecture, and close intimacy with the Roman government; the third, from 14 to 4 B.C., is the period of domestic troubles, cruelty, and misery.

**The First Period (37-28 B.C.).** — With great shrewdness and boldness Herod proceeded to remove the influences hostile to his power. Antigonus was executed, and forty-five of his more eminent supporters. Hyrcanus, who was living at Babylon, was recalled, that he might be under his influence. After his death he was appointed high priest; but, to appease his stepmother Alexandra, Herod soon after substituted in his stead her son Aristobulus, then seventeen years old. His Maccabean descent and popularity aroused the king's suspicion, and paid the forfeit of a violent death by drowning. Herod simulated sorrow before the Jewish people, but, being summoned to answer for the crime before Anthony, was acquitted. Before setting out to meet Anthony, he provided that Mariamne should be killed, in case of his being found guilty. Herod's accusation of infidelity, and his execution of Hyrcanus, and, after Anthony's defeat at Actium, went to meet the victor Augustus at Rhodes, and had his royal title confirmed.

His brilliant hospitality to Augustus at Tolemaeus (30 B.C.), and his generous treatment of his army on its way to Egypt, were rewarded by the addition of Gadara, Gaza, Samaria, and other cities, to his kingdom. In 28 Mariamne was accused by Herod of infidelity, and executed. He vainly endeavored to drown his remorse, and forget his passionate love in a tumult of lust. He was only aroused from his depression by the suspicion of plots against his throne. Alexandra was murdered, and the sons of Babas, who were of Maccabean descent.

**The Second Period (28-14 B.C.).** — Once firmly established on his throne, Herod inaugurated a period of architectural splendor and munificence. He erected a theatre in Jerusalem, and an amphitheatre outside of its walls, introducing the Greek games in honor of Augustus. He built fortresses in Galilee and Perea, and also in Jerusalem. The old city of Samaria he reconstructed, calling it Sebaste, and erected the new city of Caesarea on the site of Straton's tower. Twelve years were consumed in this last work: a theatre and an amphitheatre, with a temple dedicated to Augustus, and overlooking the city, were among its more magnificent buildings. The introduction of heathen games, and the consecration of heathen temples, enraged the Jews to the highest pitch. They plotted the king's death; but the plot was betrayed, and the guilty parties, executed. Herod endeavored to win their affection by munificent charities and by politic accommodation to their religious prejudices. In the year 25 B.C. his generous gifts alleviated the misery of a widespread famine; and five years afterwards he began the reconstruction of the temple. It was built with a lavish outlay; and, in deference to Jewish scruples, a thousand priests were employed as workmen upon the temple proper.

In the mean time Herod was growing more and more favor with the Roman emperor by timely aid to the army of the proconsul of Egypt in 24 B.C., and other evidences of loyalty. He sent his sons Alexander and Aristobulus to Rome to be educated. Augustus invited them to his palace, added to the king's dominion Trachonitis, Batanes, and Auranitis, and regarded Herod as his best friend after Agrippa.

**The Third Period (14-4 B.C.).** — The last years of Herod's life were darkened by suspicion, and made wretched by domestic troubles.
activity in building extends over into this period. He built Antipatris on the site of the Kapharsaba, the fortresses of Cypros and Phasaelis near Jericho, and beyond the confines of Palestine he adorned Ascalon, Tyre, Sidon, Damascus, Tripoli, Ptolemais, and other cities, and even Athens and Lacedemon. The activity, however, which made him famous outside of his kingdom, bittered his own subjects, the Jews, against him.

Herod's court, with his many wives and eunuchs and haters, was a scene of jealousy and plots. The first to be struck by the tempest were Herod's two sons by Mariamne, Alexander and Aristobulus, whom he sentenced to be executed 7 B.C. It was their murder which drew from Augustus the remark that he would rather be Herod's hog than his son. Then followed suspicion against Antipater, Herod's son by Doris, whom his father recalled from Rome, and executed. The restless discontent of the Jews, breaking out in continual acts of violence, added to the unhappiness of the monarch. A loathsome disease set in, his feet swelling and his bowels being afflicted with ulcers. He went to the baths of Callirhoe, at Jericho, for relief; and there he died, suffering great pains, but not before he had ordered the elders of the chief cities of the land to be confined in the amphitheatre, and to be executed at his death, that there might be some tears over his grave. This order the officers dared to disobey.

Herod was a man of fine physical powers, rare force of intellect and will, keen insight, calm presence of mind in the midst of difficulties, and daring courage. The combination of these qualities fitted him to be a general and a ruler. Nor did he lack generosity and noble magnanimity. But a bad environment and a passionate nature turned him into a heartless, despotic, and suspicious tyrant.

[It was in Herod's reign that Christ was born. The adroit invitation to the Wise Men from the East to return to Jerusalem and tell about the whereabouts of the child Jesus, under the plea of desiring to adore and worship him, is in exact accord with Herod's shrewd cunning, as the destruction of the children of Bethlehem was in harmony with the otherwise suspicious and cruel policy of his last years.]

3. Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee and Perea (Luke iii. 1) from 4 B.C. to 39 A.D., and son of Herod the Great, by his fourth wife, Malthace. Like his father, he was ambitious, and lavished large sums on public buildings. He built Tiberias, which he named in honor of the emperor. His first wife was the daughter of King Aretas; but he put her away, in order to marry Herodias, the wife of Herod Philip, his brother (not the tetrarch Philip, who married Salome). Instigated by Herodias, he went to Rome, to secure the title of king. Her ambition was his ruin. He was charged with crimes by the emissaries of Agrippa, and dismembered. He went to Rome, to secure the title of king. Her ambition was his ruin. He was charged with crimes by the emissaries of Agrippa, and banished by Caligula to Lyons. Antipas is mentioned several times in the New Testament. He was openly rebuked by John the Baptist for adultery, and, at the instigation of his enraged wife Herodias, put the prophet to death (Mark vi. 16-29). Jesus was sent to Antipas by Pilate, at his trial, on the ground that he belonged to his jurisdiction.
The king had been desirous of seeing Jesus (Luke xxiii. 7–12). The Gospels represent him as superstitious, cunning, and deprived.

6. PHILIP, tetrarch (4 B.C.–6 A.D.). See ARCHERLAUS.

5. PHILIP, tetrarch of Gaulonitis, Auranitis, etc. (4 B.C.–84 A.D.), and son of Herod the Great, by his fifth wife, Cleopatra. Unlike the rest of the Herodian family, he was distinguished for moderation and justice, and seems to have kept aloof from the intrigues of his house. He married Salome, the daughter of Herod Philip. He is mentioned Luke iii. 1.

6. HEROD PHILIP, son of Herod the Great and Mariamne, daughter of Simon. He occupied a private station. His wife was Herodias, whom Antipas seduced. In Mark vi. 17 he is called simply Philip.

7, 8. HEROD AGrippa I. and HEROD Agrippa II. See AGRIPPA.


HERODIANS are mentioned in association with the Pharisees as enemies of Jesus (Matt. xxii. 16; Mark iii. 6, xii. 13), and were probably followers of Herod Antipas, or the Herodian family generally. As such, they favored the Roman Government, and opposed the Jews, who were hostile to the Roman Government. Some of the fathers represent them as a separate Jewish sect (the fourth), whose peculiarity consisted in this, that they regarded Herod the Great as the Messiah (Epiphanius, Her., XX.; Tertull., De praescr. Append.). But, as neither Josephus nor Philo mentions such a sect, we are justified in regarding this view as based upon a misunderstanding of the name, which confused a school of political opinion with a religious sect. See STEUCH: Dissert. de Herodianis, Lund., 1706; LEUSCHNER: De secta Herod., Hirschberg, 1751; and [SCHÜBER: N. Tichte Zeitgesch., WESTCOTT, in Smith's Bible Dict.].

HERODIAS, the grand-daughter of Herod the Great, through his son Aristobulus and Berenice, the daughter of Herod's sister, Salome. Following the wish of her grandfather, she married his son (Matt. xiv. 3; called Philip in Mark vi. 17), who lived as a private man. Herod Antipas, on a visit to her husband and his brother at Rome, was enamoured of her, and seduced her to become his wife, putting away his former wife, the daughter of King Aretas. This relation was denounced by John the Baptist as adultery; and the latter was put to death by the offended jealousy of Herodias (Mark vi. 25). Her ambition precipitated her husband's deposition, but she followed him into exile. 

HERNHUT, a town of Saxony, about fifty miles from Dresden, at the foot of Mount Hubberg; was founded by Zinzendorf in 1722 for the Moravian Brethren, who are sometimes called Herrnhutters, after it.

HERVEUS, b. in Maine, entered, about 1100, the Benedictine monastery of Bourg-Dieu in Berry, and wrote commentaries, of which those on Isaiah and the Epistles of Paul have been printed (the former in 1721, the latter in 1544) among the works of Anselm, both in Migne, Patrol. Lat., vol. 181.

HERVEUS, Natalis (Hervé de Nodelloc), b. at Brittany, whence surnamed Brito; entered the Dominican order; studied in Paris, and lectured there on theology 1507–09; became general of his order in 1318, and died at Narbonne 1323. His Quodlibeta were printed in Venice, 1486; his tractate, De potestate ecclesie et papali, in Paris, 1500; and his commentaries on Petrus Lombardus, in Venice, 1506.

HERVEY, James, popular religious writer; b. at Hardingstone, near Northampton, Feb. 28, 1714; d. rector of Weston-Favel, Dec. 25, 1758. He was educated at Oxford, there came under the influence of John Wesley, and was for a time inclined to follow him, but finally adopted a strongly Calvinistic creed. He is remembered for his Meditations among the Tombs, a treatise nowadays often quoted by title, but seldom read. This, with others of a similar character, was printed under the caption Meditations and Contemplations, London, 1746, 1747, 2 vols. Once these volumes were side by side with Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress and the Whole Duty of Man, constituting the entire library of many a cottage in Great Britain. An edition of his works with Memoir was published in London, 1797, 7 vols. See TYERMANN: Oxford Methodists, New York, 1873.

HESS, Johann Jakob, b. at Zürich, Oct. 21, 1741; d. there May 29, 1828; was appointed preacher in his native city 1777, and antistate (that is, president of the clergy of the canton) in 1795. He was a very prolific writer, but his most remarkable works are his Geschichte der drei letzten Lebenjahre Jesu (Zürich, 1798–73, 6 vols.), and Jugendgeschichte Jesu (Zürich, 1773), which he afterwards combined and condensed into his Leben Jesu, Zürich, 1781, 2 vols. He also wrote Die Apostelgeschichte (Zürich, 1775, 3 vols.), and Die Geschichte der Israeliten (Zürich, 1776–88, 12 vols.), etc. He was a man of solid though not brilliant talents, a pillar of the church of his native canton for thirty-three years, universally esteemed, and a champion of historical and scriptural Christianity. His life has been written by Dr. H. Escher (Zürich, 1887), Gessner (1829), and Zimmermann (1878). 

JUSTUS HERER.

HESSE. On account of the great and frequent changes which have taken place, not only in the political organization of the country, but also in its boundary-lines, especially in 1803, 1805, 1815, and 1866, the history of the Hessian Church cannot be told, unless a great number of details are set forth which have no general interest. The state-church is evangelical, and according to the census of Dec. 1, 1875, it contains 602,810 members, divided into 418 congregations, with 445 ministers. It was organized by law of April 23, 1875, and is an imitation of the Prussian Church establishment. The Roman-Catholic inhabitants, numbering 250,130, divided into 146 arishes, belong under the jurisdiction of Mayence. The relation between the Roman curia
and the Hessian government was established by the bulls Provida soleresque (1821) and Ad dominici gregis custodiam (1827), and the edict of Oct. 2, 1829 and Jan. 30, 1830, but proved unsatisfactory to both parties. A secret convention was made in 1854 with Bishop Kettel of Mayence, but repudiated by the curia. Since 1866 all ecclesiastical relations have been estranged by secular legislation, to which the Roman curia, of course, has opposed its Non possumus. See MÜNSCHER: Geschichte d. hess. ref. Kirche, Cassel, 1850; VILMAR: Geschichte d. Konfessions-bestandens in Hessen, Marburg, 1860. [II. HEFFE: Kircheng. beider Hessen, Marburg, 1870.] K. KOEHLER.

HESSHUSEN, Tilemann, b. at Wesel, in the duchy of Cleve, Nov. 3, 1527; d. at Helmstädt, Sept. 25, 1588; studied theology at Wittenberg; travelled in England and France; and was in 1533 appointed superintendent and pastor primarius at Goslar. That office he resigned in 1558. 1557 he was expelled from Rostock, where he had become professor in the university, and pastor of the Church of St. James. 1559 he was discharged as professor at Heidelberg, and superintendent-general of the Palatinate. 1562 he was by an armed force driven out of Magdeburg, where he had been appointed first preacher at the Church of St. John. 1569 he resigned his position as court-preacher at Neuburg. 1573 he fled from Jena, where he had become professor of theology. 1577 he was deposed as bishop of Samland. Fate had overtaken him. He who triumphantly had represented Flacius as teaching that the Devil was a creator as well as God, was now proved to teach that there were two divine beings, both omnipotent. Defending himself, the old gladiator retreated from the episcopal see of Samland to a professor's chair at Helmstädt; and, though wounded, he succeeded in raising new whirlwinds of strife. He could hold peace with none. Censure, condemnation, excommunication, persecution, were, if not his heart's desire, his conception of duty; and in his will he accuses himself of having been too lenient in denunciation, too slow to attack. Nevertheless, Heper's judgment of him is too hard, calling him "one of the most odious Lutheran popes of the times", "a weather-cock." He was a consistent representative of that stand-point which makes no distinction between Christianity and theology, between the purity of faith and denominational loyalty, between church discipline and police discipline.

LIT. — J. G. LIECKFELD: Historia Hesshusiana, Quedlinburg, 1716, containing a list of Heshusen's writings (not complete, however); HELMOLT: T. H. und seine 7 exilii, Leipzig, 1869; WILKENS: T. H., ein Streittheke der Lutherskirche, Leipzig, 1873; RITTER: DEI, K. HACKENSCHMIDT.

HESYCHASTS, The, a mystic and quietistic sect which originated in the Greek Church, among the monks of Mount Athos, in the fourteenth century, and caused the last great doctrinal controversy, within the Byzantine period, of that church. At the time when Mount Athos had reached the very apex of its fame and influence, during the reign of Andronicus the Younger, when Simeon was abbot, the monks began to speak of a divine light, uncreated, and yet capable of being communicated, — the same as surrounding the Lord on Mount Thabor, but approachable by a process of complete seclusion from the world, and persistent introspection; whence the name of the sect, ἡσυχασταί, "quietists." Such ideas were by no means strange among the Greek monks. Pseude-Dionysius speaks of some extraordinary means of devotion which are drawn nearer, intellectually, to God. Similar ideas may be found in the writings of Maximus. Most probably the movement started on Mount Athos would have run its course unnoticed, if it had not been mixed up with the political and politico-ecclesiastical fermentation of the time, especially with the question of union with Rome. At the head of the Hesychasts stood Palamas, afterwards archbishop of Thessalonica. Their great adversary was Barlaam, a learned monk, who, during the reign of Andronicus the Elder, had come from Calabria to Constantinople. Barlaam protested that the divine light which the Hesychasts felt diffused through them when they sat quietly in a secluded corner and looked at their navel (whence their name, ὕμνολογία) must belong to the essence of God, if it is uncreated, and cannot without blasphemy be said to be communicable, if it belongs to the essence of God. Palamas explained that a distinction must be made between the essence of God (ὁσιός) and the activity of God (ἐνέπτυσίς); that the activity of God as a mere movement of his essence cannot be said to be created, and yet it is most certainly communicable. But Barlaam rejoined that this was simply to teach the existence of two gods; and now the case went before the "first" synod of Constantinople (1841), presided over by the Emperor Andronicus himself. Barlaam, however, got frightened when he stood before the assembly. People suspected him of being willing to sacrifice something of the famous Greek orthodoxy for the sake of his unionistic aspirations, and he felt that they suspected him. He recanted, and returned to Italy. A friend of him, Gregorius Acindynus, continued the controversy, but was condemned by the "second" synod. On the "third" synod the course seemed to have turned: the Barlaamites succeeded in condemning and deposing the "second" synod. On the "third" synod the Barlaamites succeeded in condemning and deposing the "second" synod, presided over by the Emperor Cantacuzenus (1351), finally settled the matter in favor of the Hesychasts.

LIT. — The Hist. Byzant. of Cantacuzenus sides with the Hesychasts; the Hist. Byzant. of Nicephorus Gregorius, with the Barlaamites. See SCHR: Studien über die Hesychasten des XIV. Jahrhunderts, Vienna, 1874. GASS.

HESYCHIUS is a name of frequent occurrence in the history of ancient ecclesiastical literature. We notice: (1) The editor or reviser of the Greek text of the Bible, that is the Septuagint and the New Testament, mentioned by Jerome in his letter to Pope Damasus (Ep. ad Damasum, VIII. 18) as bishop of Egypt, and martyred under Maximinus. Jerome knew his work, but rejected it. Historically, however, it has some interest to notice that a revision of the text of the New Testament should have been deemed necessary even in the third century and later. The presbyter of Jerusalem who died 436 or 438, and of whose writings some have been published in Greek or Latin version (Explanations in Levićum, Basel, 1827, etc.), while others still remain
HETÆRIÆ denotes, in the terminology of the Roman jurisprudence from the time of the emperors, any association or assembly for purposes not recognized by law; and it was as hetæria that the Christian assemblies were first interfered with by the Roman authorities. See PNEUSIS; Epist. X.

HETHERINGTON, William M., D.D., LL.D., b. near Dumfries, Scotland, June 4, 1808; d. at Glasgow, May 23, 1865. Educated at Edinburgh, ordained in the Church of Scotland, he joined the Free Church, and died as professor of apologetics and systematic theology in the Free Church College, Glasgow. He is favorably known by his History of the Westminster Assembly, Edinburgh, 1867. He was graduated at Yale College 1808, and his History of German Hymnology (3d ed.), published after his death. He was a patient investigator of history, and his writings display violent prejudices and controversial rancor. The Presbyterians were the special objects of his spleen; but even the witty churchman, Thomas Fuller, at the publication of his Church History of Britain (1655), did not escape his attacks. The latter, in an elegant epistle, however, quaintly asked, "Why should Peter fall out with Thomas, both being disciples of the same Lord and Master?"

Heylyn, Peter, church historian; b. at Burford, near Oxford, Nov. 29, 1600; d. in London, May 8, 1682, and buried in Westminster Abbey. He graduated at Magdalen College, Oxford, and lectured there on geography. These lectures were published in 1621, passed through eight editions, and appeared in an enlarged form, under the title Cosmography, 1622. He was appointed chaplain to the king in 1632, at the recommendation of Laud; in 1631 prebend of Westminister, and afterwards subdean; and was presented with several other livings. In 1631 appeared his History of St. George. He was a high Anglican, and very bitter against the Puritians. At the accusation of Prynne, whose Histriomastix he had analyzed for Charles, he was deprived by the Long Parliament of his livings, worth eight hundred pounds. He afterwards published a catalogue of his library, and obliged to go about in disguise to save himself from further hardships. At the restoration he preached a jubilant sermon to a large audience in Westminster Abbey. Heylyn was a patient investigator of history, and his learning was held in high esteem by Charles I.; but his writings display violent prejudices and controversial rancor. The Presbyterians were the special objects of his spleen; but even the witty churchman, Thomas Fuller, at the publication of his Church History of Britain (1655), did not escape his attacks. The latter, in an elegant epistle, however, quaintly asked, "Why should Peter fall out with Thomas, both being disciples of the same Lord and Master?"

Heylyn denotes, in the terminology of the Roman jurisprudence from the time of the emperors, any association or assembly for purposes not recognized by law; and it was as hetæria that the Christian assemblies were first interfered with by the Roman authorities. See PNEUSIS; Epist. X.
HEZEKIAH.

the Church of England, in the Five Controverted Points reproached with the Name of Arminianism, reprinted (1681) in the work named below. Of his many other writings, the best is Eccles. Restaurata, The History of the Reformation of the Church of England (from Edward VI. to 1566), 1681, reprinted in 2 vols. by the Ecclesiastical History Society, Cambridge, 1849. This work is written in a good style, and, in spite of Bishop Burnet's disparaging criticisms (Preface to Hist. of the Reformation), is in the main reliable, although strongly biased in the direction of High Anglicanism. In London, 1851, there appeared a reprint of several of his Historical and Miscellaneous Tracts. To this volume was prefixed his Life, written by his son-in-law, Dr. Barnard, London, 1881, reprinted in the Cambridge edition, 1849, a quaint and bombastic work. The alleged mistakes of this Life led to the preparation of another by Vernon, 1862. On pp. cvii sqq. of the Cambridge edition will be found a list of Heylyn's writings.

HEYNLIN DE LAPIDE, Johannes, one of the last eminent representatives of scholasticism; a native of Germany; studied at Leipzig, Basel, and Paris, and settled in 1473 at Basel, as teacher of philosophy and theology. He was a decided nationalist, and strongly biassed in the direction of High Anglicanism. In London, 1851, there appeared a reprint of several of his Historical and Miscellaneous Tracts. To this volume was prefixed his Life, written by his son-in-law, Dr. Barnard, London, 1881, reprinted in the Cambridge edition, 1849, a quaint and bombastic work. The alleged mistakes of this Life led to the preparation of another by Vernon, 1862. On pp. cvii sqq. of the Cambridge edition will be found a list of Heylyn's writings.

HEZEKIAH (יהוה מעז, עזיהו, abbreviated עז, "Jehovah strengthens"), son of Ahaz, and at the age of twenty-five his successor on the throne of Judah; reigned twenty-nine years, or, according to the usual chronology, from 725 to 686 B.C. But he seems to have begun his reign before 725; for the fall of Samaria (in 722) happened in its sixth year (2 Kings xviii. 10). The biblical sources of his life are 2 Kings xviii.—xx., Isa. xxxv.—xxxix., 2 Chron. xxix.—xxxii., and the contemporary utterances of Isaiah, and the Book of Micah, which was written in the first six years of Hezekiah's reign. He had no sooner ascended the throne than he entered upon a twofold policy; on the one side seeking to elevate his subjects by abolishing idolatry, and restoring the theocratic worship, and on the other to re-establish the independence of the kingdom by shaking off the yoke of Assyria. He began his reformatory activity by cleansing the temple, destroying the high places, and breaking in pieces the brazen serpent "that Moses had made" (2 Kings xviii. 4). Then followed the restoration of the worship of Jehovah. A great passover was celebrated, to which all the members of the reformed party in Judah were invited. It was celebrated at an unusual but not illegal time (Num. ix. 10—14), and lasted fourteen days. Idolatry continued to be prevalent in Judah during the first year of the reign, and was never wholly abolished by Hezekiah (2 Kings xxiii. 15; Isa. xxx. 22, xxxi. 7); but, by the irresistible testimony of Isaiah (xxvii. 7; comp. 2 Chron. xxx. 14, xxxi. 1), it was he, and not Josiah, who centralized the worship at Jerusalem, and destroyed the high places.

A great injury to the state was done by the aristocratic party, which perpetrated the unhealthy policy of Ahaz, and instead of bearing with resignation the Assyrian yoke, as Isaiah advised (x. 24, 27, xxx. 15 sqq.), clamored for an Egyptian alliance, which would enable them to shake off the Assyrian power. It was formerly thought that an alliance with Egypt was made soon after the beginning of Sennacherib's reign; and it would seem, from Isa. xxxvi. 1, that he combined with his campaign against Egypt one against Judah in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah's reign. But monumental records have shown that Sennacherib did not ascend the throne till 705 B.C.; so that his campaign against Egypt and Judah did not occur till the last period of Hezekiah's reign; and the false date of Isa. xxxvi. 1 is to be attributed to a wrong arrangement of the four incidents in Isa. xxxvi.—xxxix. Hezekiah purchased, as he thought, a permanent peace with the Assyrians by the payment of a large sum of money (2 Kings xviii. 13 sqq.), but wrongly; for the king, after receiving the money, broke his word, and continued his march against Jerusalem. The city seemed to be hopelessly doomed (Isa. xxxvii. 1—3); but Isaiah predicted supernatural succor, which came in the descent of "the angel of the Lord, who smote the camp of the Assyrians" (Isa. xxxvii. 36). In the monumental records of Sennacherib's campaign against Hezekiah, this terrible calamity is not referred to; but a striking gap occurs in the account. After stating, "I shut him up in Jerusalem, the place of his residence, like a bird in a cage. I raised up walls against him, and closed up the exits of his city door," it suddenly breaks off, and does not speak of the city's having been taken. Herodotus (ii. 141) relates the remarkable story, that, when Sennacherib advanced upon Egypt, armies of mice, in answer to the prayer of the Egyptian king, Sethon, invaded the Assyrian camp by night, gnawed the quivers, bows, and the handles of the shields of the Assyrians, so that they fled the next morning in terror. He also mentions a stone statue of Sethon holding a mouse in his hand, which was preserved in the temple of Hephestos. Ewald refers these two records to two different calamities, and supposes, with Josephus, that the angel of the Lord spread a virulent plague in the Assyrian army. However, the account of Herodotus points to this very thing (for mice were symbolic of plagues: 1 Sam. vi. 4), and is to be regarded as based on the production of the causes of Sennacherib's disaster in Judah. The profound impression which this calamity made is seen in Ps. xlv., lxxv., lxxvi., and in the honor in which Hezekiah was held by surrounding nations (2 Chron. xxxii. 23). The miraculous deliverance is also referred to in 1 Macc. vii. 41; 2 Macc. viii. 3; 13. 5. Hezekiah was taken ill after this event; but fifteen years were added to his life in answer to prayer (Isa. xxxvii. 5). The meaning of the sign on the sun-dial, which vouched for Hezekiah's recovery, is clear (Isa. xxviii. 8). The life of the king, which was regarded as being at an
end, was, as it were, put back fifteen years. As in the case of the sun standing still over Gibeon, there was, in this instance, no change of the usual relations of the sun and the earth. As at Gibeon the reference is only to an extraordinary continuance of the daylight, so here the reference is to a remarkable shining of the sun's rays, which stood in a relation of cause and effect to the prophet's known wondrous exhibition of divine power. Hezekiah was one of the restorers of the 'TWW' (that is, the instrumental and vocal music of the Levites), and revived the use of David's and Asaph's psalms. He also appointed a commission to edit the second collection of the Solomonic proverbs. [See the Histories of Israel by EWALD (vol. iii.) and STANLEY, who devotes a whole chapter (xxxviii.) to Hezekiah, and the art. Hezekiah in Smith's Bible Dictionary by Canon Farrar.]

HICKS, ELIAS, a prominent minister of the society of Friends; b. at Hempstead, L.i. March 19, 1748; d. in Jericho, L.i. Feb. 27, 1830. He was a mechanic in the early part of his life, but later devoted himself to agriculture. When he was twenty-seven, to use his own words, he began to have 'openings leading to the ministry,' and subsequently became a noted preacher, and travelled extensively among the Yearly Meetings of American Friends, preaching. When the more liberal element of the society of Friends, in the Yearly Meeting of Philadelphia in 1827, broke off from the more conservative wing, they were called Hicksites. They became Unitarians; but, although Mr. Hicks used ambiguous language concerning the Trinity, it can hardly be made out that he promulgated views subversive of the doctrine. He published Observations on Slavery, (N.Y., 1825), Extemporaneous Discourses (Phila., 1825), Journal of Religious Life and Labors (N.Y., 5th ed., 1832). See art. Friends, etc.

HICKSTITES. See Hicks and Friends.

HID'DEKEL. See TIGRIS.

HIERARCHY (from iepér, "sacred," and épxuv, "ruler") denotes a form of government in which the governing body claims to hold its power by divine injunction, and to transmit it through a sacramental act. The Roman Church probably presents the most perfect instance of a hierarchy which history ever saw, organized monarchical, the whole power centring in the Pope, and most minutely graded, both with respect to orders, — bishops, priests, deacons, subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, lectors, doorkeepers, etc. (the ordines juris ecclesiastici), and with respect to jurisdiction, — archbishops, metropolitan, exarchs, patriarchs, deans, vicars, cardinals, legates, etc. In the Greek Church the hierarchy is organized on the same plan, as the several patriarchs there is no pope. In the evangelical churches, where the State rules the Church, more or less of the hierarchical apparatus may be retained, as may be noticed by comparing the Church of England and the Protestant Church; while, when the Church is established on the principle of universal priesthood, and the congregation rules itself, as in the American churches and many free churches in Europe, all hierarchy disappears. See Church, Clergy, Jurisdiction.

HIERACAS, or HIERAX, was born about 275 A.D.; lived at Leontopolis in Phrygia; took an active part in Diocletian's persecution of the Christians, and wrote a work against Christianity, which has become lost, but is tolerably known to us through Eusebius' answer, Contra Hieroclem. According to Eusebius, the only thing new and original in the book was a parallel drawn between Christ and Apollonius of Tyana; else the work was only an imitation of Celsus and Porphyry. Not to be confounded with this Hierocles is the Neo-Platonist philosopher of the same name, but of much a later date.

HIEROGLYPHICS (from the Greek ipeékos, "sacred," and épxuv, "to carve") are pictures of animate or inanimate objects which are intended to convey ideas and words. They are found in all parts of the world, but the term usually relates to the Egyptian variety. For many years these latter hieroglyphics were a puzzle to the curious, but now they are perfectly intelligible. The key to them was the Rosetta Stone, now in the British Museum. One of Napoleon's officers discovered it in 1798 among the ruins of Fort St. Julien, near the mouth of the Rosetta branch of the Nile; but by the treaty of Alexandria it was given up to the English (1801). In honor of Ptolemy V. (B.C. 195), written in Greek, hieroglyphic and demotic. The first clue was the discovery, that the name Ptolemy occurred in the Greek, and that, in a corresponding part of the hieroglyphics, there were characters enclosed in a ring, and these, it was conjectured, might be the hieroglyphics for Ptolemy. De Sacy announced the phonetic character of the name; Young and Champollion simultaneously (1817) announced the union in the characters of ideographic and phonetic elements. The Egyptian hieroglyphics are for the most part engraved: in old temples they are found in high relief. They are generally written from right to left, but are read either vertically or horizontally. They ceased to be written about 300 A.D. See for their decipherment, etc., the elaborate article by R. S. Poole, in the ninth edition of Encycl. Brit., vol. xi. 794—509. The great dictionary of Egyptian hieroglyphics is that by Heinrich Brugsch, Liefmann's demotisches Worterbuch, Leipzig, 1867—82, 7 vols.

HIERONYMITES, or HERMITS OF ST. JE-ROME, is the name of several independent orders...
Hieronymus. See Jerome.

High Church is the designation of a school in the Church of England and the Episcopal Church of the United States, which has stress on the propriety of an elaborate ritual in worship. Reformers of the Elizabethan period condemned this tradition, and often introduce into the service the specific designation of a sanctuary, or any elevation which worship and sacrifices were offered both to idols (Num. xii. 41, etc.) and to Jehovah (1 Sam. ix. 12, etc.) and ex res mention is made of the "houses," on the high places (2 Chron. xxxi. 1, etc.), and frequently groves also (2 Chron. xxxiv. 3, etc.). The worship at the high places seems to have consisted mainly of sacrifice (1 Sam. ix. 12) and the burning of incense (2 Kings xiv. 4, etc.). They were served by priests, who were, for the most part at least, not Levites (1 Kings xii. 31; 2 Chron. xl. 15).

II. History of the Worship on the High Places. I. From Abraham to Solomon. — It was a natural and at first an innocent impulse which led men to resort to the hills for worship. The worshipers were brought near to the heavens, and the separation of those retired eminences from the scenes of the usual routine of daily occupation suggested the idea of sacredness.

The patriarchs built altars wherever they pitched their tents (Gen. xxxi. 25, xxxviii. 16), but they seem also to have frequently chosen eminences. Abraham went to a mountain in the land of Moriah to sacrifice Isaac (Gen. xxii. 2), and Jacob offered sacrifice on Mount Gilead (Gen. xxxiii. 19). Eleazar with the garments of the high priest and Jacob ofiered sacrifice on Mount Gilead (Gen. xxvi. 25).

The Moabites set apart special hills or mountains for the worship of Baal. To these high places of Baal, Balak conducted Balaam (Num. xxiii. 1). Baal-Peor was a mountain sacred to him (Num. xxxii. 28, 29). Nebo was probably also sacred to the divinity of that name (Isa. xlv. 1).

The patriarchs built altars wherever they pitched their tents (Gen. xxxi. 25, xxxviii. 16), but they seem also to have frequently chosen eminences. Abraham went to a mountain in the land of Moriah to sacrifice Isaac (Gen. xxii. 2), and Jacob offered sacrifice on Mount Gilead (Gen. xxxiii. 19). At a later period Mount Sinai was regarded as especially sacred (Exod. xxxiv. 5). The Moabites built altars wherever they pitched their tents (Gen. xxxi. 25, xxxviii. 16), but they seem also to have frequently chosen eminences. Abraham went to a mountain in the land of Moriah to sacrifice Isaac (Gen. xxii. 2), and Jacob offered sacrifice on Mount Gilead (Gen. xxxiii. 19). At a later period Mount Sinai was regarded as especially sacred (Exod. xxxiv. 5). The Moabites built altars wherever they pitched their tents (Gen. xxxi. 25, xxxviii. 16), but they seem also to have frequently chosen eminences. Abraham went to a mountain in the land of Moriah to sacrifice Isaac (Gen. xxii. 2), and Jacob offered sacrifice on Mount Gilead (Gen. xxxiii. 19). At a later period Mount Sinai was regarded as especially sacred (Exod. xxxiv. 5). The Moabites built altars wherever they pitched their tents (Gen. xxxi. 25, xxxviii. 16), but they seem also to have frequently chosen eminences. Abraham went to a mountain in the land of Moriah to sacrifice Isaac (Gen. xxii. 2), and Jacob offered sacrifice on Mount Gilead (Gen. xxxiii. 19). At a later period Mount Sinai was regarded as especially sacred (Exod. xxxiv. 5). The Moabites built altars wherever they pitched their tents (Gen. xxxi. 25, xxxviii. 16), but they seem also to have frequently chosen eminences. Abraham went to a mountain in the land of Moriah to sacrifice Isaac (Gen. xxii. 2), and Jacob offered sacrifice on Mount Gilead (Gen. xxxiii. 19). At a later period Mount Sinai was regarded as especially sacred (Exod. xxxiv. 5). The Moabites built altars wherever they pitched their tents (Gen. xxxi. 25, xxxviii. 16), but they seem also to have frequently chosen eminences. Abraham went to a mountain in the land of Moriah to sacrifice Isaac (Gen. xxii. 2), and Jacob offered sacrifice on Mount Gilead (Gen. xxxiii. 19). At a later period Mount Sinai was regarded as especially sacred (Exod. xxxiv. 5). The Moabites built altars wherever they pitched their tents (Gen. xxxi. 25, xxxviii. 16), but they seem also to have frequently chosen eminences. Abraham went to a mountain in the land of Moriah to sacrifice Isaac (Gen. xxii. 2), and Jacob offered sacrifice on Mount Gilead (Gen. xxxiii. 19). At a later period Mount Sinai was regarded as especially sacred (Exod. xxxiv. 5).
ed on Mount Ebal (Deut. xxvii. 5; Josh. vii. 30). Of the period prior to Samuel, the term "high place" was only used three times of high places where worship was idolatrous (1 Kings xxiv. 22), and only twice in all. Only in one of these cases is there reference to their use by the Hebrews (Lev. xxvi. 30). The words in this verse "I will destroy your high places," are proleptic, and announce the punishment to follow upon disobedience. In the time of the judges the high places are not once mentioned by name. In that period of national custom, the high places were not confined to the tabernacle (Judg. ii. 5, vi. 26, xii. 19); the more primitive custom of the patriarchs still prevailed. It was a period of transition; and, although the tabernacle was no doubt held in honor, the tribes were isolated from it by the constant warfare of the times. In the time of Samuel one high place is made prominent as a place of sacrifice (1 Sam. ix. 12, 19, 25). It is to be particularly noticed that only a single high place is referred to, and also that the prophets, as it would seem, had their dwelling-place there (1 Sam. x. 5). Of the reign of David we have not much information; but it is evident that David worshipped on Mount Olivet (2 Sam. xv. 32), and offered sacrifices at local altars (1 Chron. xxi. 26). The survey of the history of Israel from Moses to the time of Solomon shows that the notices of high places are remarkably few: in fact, there is reference only to a single high place as being used for worship, and that under the rule of Samuel, if we leave out the isolated passage Lev. xxvi. 30, whose meaning is doubtful.

4. From Solomon to Hezekiah. — In the reign of Solomon we are suddenly confronted by an unusual development of the worship on high places. It was accounted as one of the sins of this king, that he burnt sacrifices on high places (1 Kings ili. 3). The "great high place" was at Gibeon (1 Kings ili. 4); where, however, the tabernacle was also deposited (1 Chron. xvi. 39; 2 Chron. i. 3). Both Asa and his father, King Joshua, were sovereigns of these sanctuaries (1 Kings xii. 32). In order to satisfy his foreign wives, Solomon built high places for "Ashethoth, the abomination of the Zidonians, for Chemosh, the abomination of the Moabites, and for Milcom, the abomination of the children of Ammon" (1 Kings xi. 7; 2 Kings xxii. 13). In spite of the construction of the temple, this idolatrous worship introduced from foreign nations, and the worship of Jehovah on high places, went on increasing under Rehoboam (1 Kings xiv. 23) and Jeroboam in the two kingdoms. Elijah complains that the altars of God are thrown down, and himself burns incense on the reconstructed altar on Mount Carmel (1 Kings xviii. 19 sqq.). Both Asa (1 Kings xv. 14) and Jehoshaphat (1 Kings xxii. 43) allowed some of the high places to remain (presumably those on which sacrifice was offered to Jehovah), but destroyed the former shrines (2 Kings xxiii. 17, comp. xiv. 5; xx. 33, comp. xvii. 6). Under Jehoash (2 Kings xii. 3), Amaziah (2 Kings xiv. 4), Azariah (2 Kings xv. 4), and Jotham (2 Kings xv. 33) it is also stated that they were allowed to remain untouched; but in each of these cases the fact is stated as derogating from their religious reputation. It is probable that the number was increased in "every city" (2 Kings xvii. 11; 2 Chron. xxviii. 25); and the people very generally participated in the worship. It is very difficult to determine how far this worship was legitimate (1 Kings xi. 24), and how far it was rendered to Jehovah. The notices refer now to the one, now to the other, but leave the impression that the high places were regarded (after the construction of the temple) as illegitimate (1 Kings ili. 2-4), and the result of foreign and heathenish innovation (2 Kings xvii. 11, xxiii. 13, etc.).

3. From Hezekiah to Ezra. — With Hezekiah a new period begins in the history of the worship on high places. This king, so zealous in the cause of ecclesiastical reformation, sought to centralize the sacrifices of Israel at one altar. He declared war against the local shrines on high places (2 Kings xvii. 4, 22; 2 Chron. xxx. 12; Isa. xxxvi. 7), which had tended so much to detract from the honor of the temple, and to make popular idolatrous rites. He was only partially successful. Under his successor, Manasseh, his policy was overthrown, and the worship on high places was again in full swing. But the fatal blow had been given. Hezekiah had acted out the determined voice of the prophets (Isa. iii. 7; Jer. vii. 18; Ezek. vi. 3; Hos. vi. 8, etc.); and it only remained for Josiah, under the pious impulse which the discovery of the book of the law had inspired (2 Kings xxiii. 2), to complete the work his great predecessor had inaugurated (2 Kings xxii. 8). After the exile, the high places were not revived; and the need of having some places of worship subordinate to the one single altar of sacrifice was later supplied by the synagogues (Riehm).

III. RELATION OF THE HIGH PLACES TO THE TEMPLE. — It has been urged that there is no place in the Pentateuch for any other place of worship than the one central altar of sacrifice (tabernacle and temple). Such worship, however, was practised not only on the high places ("sanctuaries"), but at Bochim (Judg. vii. 19), upon a rock by Manoah (Judg. xii. 16), at Mizpah (1 Sam. vii. 10) and Bethlehem (1 Sam. vii. 23) by Samuel, on the threshing-floor of Ornan by David (1 Chron. xxii. 26), by the priest of Nob (1 Sam. xii. 2 sqq.), on Carmel (1 Kings xviii. 30, 38), and at other places of which we have distinct notice. On the basis of the prevalence and apparent legitimacy of such worship, and the prior assumption that the Law permits only one altar, the conclusion has been confidently drawn, that parts of the Pentateuch (Deuteronomy and the so-called priestly Thorah) must belong to Josiah's reign, or a later date (Weilhausen, Professor W. R. Smith, Baudissin, etc.). The discussion of the bearing of this fact upon the date of the Pentateuch does not belong here (the supposition of a late origin of the Pentateuch makes it difficult to understand why the references to Hebrew worship on high places are confined to the Military passage) but it is the problem of the relation of these local shrines to the Pentateuchal commandments and to the central altar of sacrifice. The above survey indicates that the state of the case after the construction of the temple, and before that event, when the tabernacle was shifted from place to place, is not the same, and the two periods must be discussed separately.
HIGH PLACES.

It has been urged that the worship at the local altars was practiced in ignorance of the commandment in Deut. xii. 1-11, enjoining one central altar, or in deliberate disobedience of it, or out of a misunderstanding of its meaning. The rabbis supposed that the rule was superseded by a special divine intimation. But none of these considerations sufficiently presents the case as it existed before the erection of the temple; and none of them are necessary for the explanation of the apparent anomaly.

1. It is quite doubtful whether the Mosaic ordinance (Deut. xii. 10, etc.) was meant to absolutely exclude all other places of worship (De Wette, Riehm, etc.). In Exod. xx. 24 a plurality of altars is presupposed, and the mode of erecting them definitely defined by Moses. These altars, so far as they were erected to Jehovah, were not necessarily a breach of the ordinance and t e "Priestly Thorah," as the absence of notices of the sacrifice at one altar was prospective (Lev. xvii. 3-9; Deut. xii. 10), and not to be enforced till after the temple was built, the worship at the high places was largely idolatrous. In proportion as the temple was forgotten, the sacrifices at local altars were genuine, and the temple did "as the heathen did" (2 Kings xvii. 11, xxiii. 13, etc.).

2. The necessities of the case demanded local shrines. The history of the times, as well as special events, is in favor of this view. The anarchy of the period of the Judges, the rivalries between the tribes, and the constant instability of affairs to the time of Solomon, made it impossible for the tribes to go up regularly to the tabernacle. An altar was erected on Ebal by Joshua (Josh. viii. 30), while the tabernacle was close by at Gilgal, and it was not felt to be an anomaly. Local shrines were a necessity of the case, and as natural to the instincts of the people as they were consistent with the Jehovah-worship. The whole land was the sanctuary of Jehovah (Riehm).

3. The commandment centralizing worship and sacrifice at one altar was prospective (Lev. xvii. 3-9; Deut. xii. 10), and not to be enforced till a later date (Farrar, Riehm, etc.). The law was proleptic; and the menace of Lev. xxvi. 30 had an eye to the Moabite idolatries, as is evident from the connection. The people were to be trained up to that idea, and principally by the Jehovah-worship, and how far the sacrifices at local altars were genuine, and the temple did as the heathen did (2 Kings xvii. 11, xxiii. 13, etc.).

4. It is hard at this time to distinguish how far the sacrifices at local altars were genuine Jehovah-worship, and how far the practices followed the fashions of the surrounding nations. The people not only did not fully obey the command of Moses and Joshua to destroy the altars of the Canaanites (Judg. ii. 2, etc.), but adopted the idolatries of their neighbors (Judg. ii. 11, 12, etc.).

5. The principle of the local worship of Jehovah was preserved, long after the high places were destroyed, in the synagogues.

Of the continuance of the high places and their altars of sacrifice after the construction of the temple, the following is to be said. (1) The worship on high places increased enormously under Solomon, and was largely the result of contact with foreign nations. Solomon increased the shrines in proportion to the diffusion of his influence. The people, always inclined to idolatry, were not slow in following their king's example. (2) Under the worst kings (Rehoboam, Jeroboam, Ahaz) the high places were most numerous. Later and better kings seem to have made a distinction between idolatrous and Jehovah-worship shrines; but it is said of at least five of them (see above), to their disparagement, that they allowed them still to stand. (3) It is plain, that, after the temple was built, the worship at the high places was largely idolatrous. In proportion as the temple was forgotten, the sacrifices at local altars were genuine, and the temple did "as the heathen did" (2 Kings xvii. 11, xxiii. 13, etc.).

(4) It is evident that there must have been some development in the minds of the people in favor of the central temple, and against all high places, before Hezekiah's reign. (5) In general, the ritual and worship at these local altars, after Solomon's accession, must be regarded as having degenerated from the old and better standard. It has been said that the "temple of Solomon never stands contrasted with the popular high places as the seat of the Levitical system" (Professor Smith, chap. ix.). But the very construction and existence of the temple were a protest against the local worship. The statement also ignores the fact that the priests at the local shrines were, for the most part at least, not Levites, and stood in antagonism to the priesthood of the temple (1 Kings xii. 31; 2 Kings xxii. 9; 2 Chron. xi. 16).

They seem to have been a distinct order. Moreover, the same books of the Kings and Chronicles give the account of the temple, its building and furniture, which describe the development and flourishing condition of the worship on the high places; so that violent injustice must be done to the probational and anticipatory purpose of the temple itself; instead of evoking the conclusion that the temple was meant to be the central shrine, and that the sacrificial worship at the local altars was thenceforth illegitimate.

As in the case of so many other truths of divine revelation, the people in this one likewise failed for a while to comprehend its spirit, and to obey the letter, but afterwards were led to fall in with the providential design. Not only was the temple ignored by the erection of many local altars, but the very temple itself was despoiled by kings heathen in practice, like Ahaz (2 Chron. xxviii. 24 sq.), and made the receptacle for heathen altars and heathen rites.

Lit. — Gesenius: Thesaurus; Oehler: A. Tische Theol., I. p. 383 sq.; Speaker's Commentary, Leviticus, Excurssus on chap. xxvi.; the excellent art. Höendienst, by Riehm, in Riehm's Handwörterbuch; arts. High Places, in Smith's Bibl. Dict. (Canon Farrar) and Schaff's Bible Dict. For views opposite to those expressed above, see Wellhausen: Gesch. Israels, pp. 17-53 (Der Ort d. Gottesdienstes); W. R. Smith: The O. T. in the Jewish Church, chap. ix.; Kuenen: Religion of Israel (London, 1914); the art. Höendienst, in Herzog, R. E., 2d ed. (by
HIGH PRIEST.

The high priest was the spiritual head and representative of the theocratic people before Jehovah. In him was concentrated the mediatorialship between God and people; and in him the people could draw nigh to God. As in his person the people was represented, his sin offerings and that of the congregation, which was to be brought for certain sins, as prescribed Lev. iv., were the same. His sin was the people's sin (Lev. iv., and God's good will towards the high priest also belonged to the people. The high priest was in the midst of a holy people, "the saint of the Lord" (Ps. cvi.16). In him the highest degree of purity had to be found, and in exceptional cases (Lev. xxi.1—6) could he defile himself. Otherwise he had to avoid every thing whereby he could be defiled. He had even to keep away from his dead father or mother (xxi.10—12). His wife was to be a virgin of his own people (xxi.14). Aaron's consecration to the priesthood was in connection with that of his sons and the priests generally (Exod. xxix.; Lev. viii.). The ritual commenced by washing Aaron and his sons before the tabernacle of the congregation. Aaron was then invested with the sacred garments, and anointed with the holy oil, which was prepared according to Exod. xxx. 22—25. Aaron's successor was not anointed, but received only the high priest's garments. Without these garments, the high priest was only a private person, who could not represent the people, and incurred the penalty of death by appearing before Jehovah without them (Exod. xxviii. 38). His dress was peculiar, and passed to his successor at his death. The articles of his dress consisted of the following parts: (1) The breeches, or drawers, of linen, covering the loins and thighs; (2) The coat, a tunic or long shirt; (3) The girdle, also of linen: these three articles he had in common with the other priests. Over these parts he wore (4) the robe, or the ephod, being all of blue. The skirt of his robe had a remarkable trimming of pomegranates in blue, red, and crimson, with a bell of gold between each pomegranate alternately. The bells were to give a sound when the high priest went in and came out of the holy place (Exod. xxviii. 35). Over the robe came (5) the ephod, one part of which covered the back, and the other the front: upon it was placed (6) the breastplate. The covering of the head was (7) the mitre, or upper turban, which was different from (8) the bonnet. The mitre had a gold plate, engraved with "Holiness to the Lord," fastened to it by a ribbon of blue. For the functions to be performed annually on the day of atonement, dresses of white linen were prescribed (Lev. xvi. 4). The office of the Old-Testament priesthood was twofold; the external, which was in Max. Bibl. Patrum, xxx. 9 sq.; or messenger of the Lord (Mal. ii. 7). The functions of the high priest were the same as those of the common priests. He had oversight over the service of the temple and the temple treasury (2 Kings xxiii. 4 sq.). The succession in the high priestly office was regulated in the manner of the right of succession.—that the first son, provided there were no legal difficulties, succeeded his father; and, in case he had died already, his oldest son followed. The number of high priests from Aaron to Phinehas was, according to Josephus (Antiq. xx. 1129) eight-three; viz., from Aaron to Solomon, thirteen; during the temple of Solomon, eighteen; and fifty-two in the time of the second temple. Aaron was succeeded by Eleazar (Num. xx. 28), who was followed by Phinehas (Judg. xx. 28). Who the successors of Phinehas were till the times of Eliz, we do not know. To enter into the different theories of who they were, or were not, is not our object. From Shalum, the father of Hilikiah, the high priest in Josiah's reign, we can again follow up the succession of high priests. According to Josephus, Hilikiah was followed by Seraiah, who was killed by Nebuchadnezzar at Riblah (2 Kings xxv. 18 sq.). His son was Jehozadak, who went into the captivity (1 Chron. v. 41; A. V., vi. 15), and who was the father of Jehoshua, who opened the series of high priests in Neh. xii., which ends with Jaddua, who was high priest in the time of Alexander the Great. Jaddua was followed by Onias I., his son, and he again by Simon I., the Just; then followed Onias II., Simon II., Onias III. The last high priest was Phannias, who was appointed by lot by the Zealots (Josephus, War, iv. 3, 8). With him the Old-Testament high priesthood ignominiously ended. 

HILARY THE DEACON.

HILARY OF ARLES (Hilarius Areolatensis), St., b. 403; d. 449; entered very early the monastery of Lerium, where his uncle, Honoratus, was abbot. Honoratus afterwards became Bishop of Arles; and on his death (429) Hilarius succeeded him in the episcopal chair. He was very enthusiastic for the ideas of monasticism, and lived together with the clergy of his church as monks in a monastery. In spite, however, of his personal humility, he was rather haughty when exercising his official authority. As Bishop of Arles he was metropolitan of the provinces of Vien- nesia and Narbonnensis; and as such he came into conflict with Leo I., who, however, compelled him to yield. He wrote a Vita S. Honorati, a poem on the creation, etc., which have been edited by Salinas, Rome, 1731, who, however, ascribes several works to him which are not by him, and are found under Hilarion, S. Honoratus, Gelasius, etc. His works include: Christlich-römische Literatur. HERZOG.
HILARY.


HILARY (Hilarius), Bishop of Rome 461-468; the successor of Leo I.; was a native of Sardinia; and was present at the Robber Synod of Ephesus (449) as papal legate. As pope he showed himself zealous for the maintenance of the metropolitical system, for the establishment of annual provincial synods, etc.

HILARY, Bishop of Poitiers (Pictarium), the place of his birth, was born early in the fourth century; d. 396. He shone like a clear star alongside of the great champions of the Nicene Creed,—Athanasius, Basil, and the two Gregories. Among the teachers of the West of his day he was beyond dispute the first, and bore a strong resemblance to Tertullian, both in disposition and scientific method. He employed an elegant Latin style. His parents were Pagan, and of high social standing. Hilary enjoyed the facilities for education. In the introduction to his treatise on the Trinity he describes the stages a Pagan passes through in reaching the knowledge of God, which heathen philosophy reveals dimly, Christianity clearly. This description evidently depicts his own experience. He had reached the years of manhood when he professed Christianity. A statement of uncertain value speaks of his wife and daughter as following him. About the year 350 the popular voice called him to the bishopric of Poitiers.

The times were times of conflict. The Emperor Constantius determined to make Arianism the prevailing creed of the West, as it had become of the East. This end he endeavored to secure by intimidating the bishops. Hilary placed himself in antagonism to the emperor, and devoted all his energies to resist the spread of Arianism. His persuasions induced a number of the Gallic bishops to refuse communion with Auxentius, the Arians were in the majority, and voluntary substitution of himself, out of love, in our stead. Between the God-man and the believer there is a vital communion. As the Logos is in the Father, by reason of his divine birth, so we are in him, and become partakers of his nature, and especially on his birth from the Father, which he insists involves identity of essence. In the elaboration of the divine-human personality of Christ, he is more original and profound. The incarnation was a movement of the Logos towards humanity in order to lift humanity up to participation in the divine nature. It consisted in a self-emptying of himself, and the assumption of human nature. In this process he lost none of his divine nature; and, even during the humiliation, he continued to reign everywhere in heaven and on earth. Christ assumed body, soul, and spirit, and passed through all stages of human growth, present by nature, subject to pain and death. Redemption is the result of Christ's voluntary substitution of himself, out of love, in our stead.

HILDA, b. at Lavardin, in the department of Loir-et-Cher, 1055; d. at Tours, Dec. 18, 1194; was, according to some, a pupil of Berenger; according to others, a monk of Cluny; superintended the cathedral-school of Le Mans from 1079 to 1092, and was in 1096 or 1098 chosen bishop of that diocese. In this position he encountered much trouble from his own chapter, from William Rufus of England, from the revival preacher Henry of Lausanne, and others. At one time he even went to Rome, demanding to be relieved from his duties; but Paschalis II. would not give his consent. In 1125 he was chosen Archbishop of Tours; and there, too, he met with difficulties, though in the mean time he had raised himself to one of the foremost places among the ecclesiastics of his time. His works were first edited by A. Beaugendre (Paris, 1708), and then by J. J. Bourassé, in Migne: Patrologia Latina, Tom. 1, 1871. They consist of Epistolae to Bernard of Clairvaux, Anselm, William of Champeaux, and others, Diplomata, Sermones (a hundred and forty-three in Aline), Opuscula (among which are Libellus de quaeru viribus, strongly influenced by Cicero, and Tractatus theologicius, probably nothing but a fragment of the summa of Hugo de St. Victor), and finally Poemata. His life was written by Hebert-Duperron (1588) and Deservilliers (1877). Full information as to the literature is found in Chalier: Repertoire, 1878, Wagenmann.

HILDEBRAND. See GREGORY VII.

HILDEGARDE, b. in the castle of Böckelheim, 1098; was educated in the Benedictine nunnery of Disobodenberg, by Jutta von Sponheim, whom she succeeded as abbess in 1138; and in 1147 the monastery of Rupertenberg, where she died in 1178. She received prophetic visions; and, as these were recognized by the Church, she came gradually to occupy a very exceptional position, and to exercise a very extraordinary influence, in the German Church. She is commemorated on Sept. 17, but she was never canonized. Her writings, Scivias (first printed in Paris, 1513, and Cologne, 1628), Liber Divinorum Operum, Explanatio Regula: S. Benedicti, Physica (nine books), Letters, etc., are found in Migne: Patrologia Latina, Tom. 16, 1877. Her life was written by Stilling, in A. S. Bolli. ad 17 Sept., and by Dahn, Mayendorf, 1852. Complete biographical information is found in Linne: Die Handschr. d. Landesbibliothek Wiesbaden, Wiesbaden, 1877. [See also Richard: Sainte Hildegarde, Aix, 1876.]

HILL, Rowland, an eccentric and popular English preacher; b. at Hawkestone, Aug. 23, 1744; d. in London, April 11, 1833. In 1764 he entered St. John's College, Cambridge, but his university course he came under the influence of Mr. Whitefield and the Methodists. He aroused opposition by preaching without a license, and by following the methods of the Methodists, and only secured ordination after six bishops had refused to perform the service. In 1778 he obtained the parish of Kingston, Somersetshire, but continued to indulge his favorite taste for open-air preaching. In 1783 he built Surrey Chapel, London, having fallen heir to a considerable fortune. He continued to preach until the very day of his death, attracting immense audiences wherever he went. In the summer months he went off on preaching-tours through Great Britain. He was an eccentric man, and gifted with wit, and rare powers of drollery, which he used in the service of religion. Sheridan used to say, "I go to hear Rowland Hill, because his ideas come red-hot from the heart." In the Arminian controversy he espoused the Calvinistic side, and wrote some bitter pamphlets against John Wesley, the tone of which he afterwards regretted. His principal work was the collection of Village Dialogues (1810, 34th ed., 1839), in which he treats of current religious abuses, and general religious topics, in a homely and familiar, but terse and often sarcastic way. See Life, by Stoney, London, 1833 (4th ed., 1844); Memoirs, by Rev. W. Jones, London, 2d ed., 1840; and Memoirs, by Sherman; London, 1851.

HILDEGGARD. See FRIAR HILDEGARD.

HILDEGARDE, Vol. I, p. 998. See the Church Histories of Neander, Milman, Schaff, etc., and DORNER'S HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

HILDA, St., a grand-niece of Edwin, king of Northumbria; b. about 617; devoted herself to a religious life from her thirteenth year; became abbess of Heorta (now Hartlepool) in 650, and founded the cathedral-school of Whitby, where she died 680. See BUTLER: Lives of Saints, Nov. 18; Mrs. Jameson: Legends of the Monastic Orders, pp. 58-62.

HILDEBERT, b. at Lavardin, in the department of Loir-et-Cher, 1055; d. at Tours, Dec. 18, 1194; was, according to some, a pupil of Berenger; according to others, a monk of Cluny; superintended the cathedral-school of Le Mans from 1079 to 1092, and was in 1096 or 1098 chosen bishop of that diocese. In this position he encountered much trouble from his own chapter, from William Rufus of England, from the revival preacher Henry of Lausanne, and others. At one time he even went to Rome, demanding to be relieved from his duties; but Paschalis II. would not give his consent. In 1125 he was chosen Archbishop of Tours; and there, too, he met with difficulties, though in the mean time he had raised himself to one of the foremost places among the ecclesiastics of his time. His works were first edited by A. Beaugendre (Paris, 1708), and then by J. J. Bourassé, in Migne: Patrologia Latina, Tom. 1, 1871. They consist of Epistolae to Bernard of Clairvaux, Anselm, William of Champeaux, and others, Diplomata, Sermones (a hundred and forty-three in Aline), Opuscula (among which are Libellus de quaeru viribus, strongly influenced by Cicero, and Tractatus theologicius, probably nothing but a fragment of the summa of Hugo de St. Victor), and finally Poemata. His life was written by Hebert-Duperron (1588) and Deservilliers (1877). Full information as to the literature is found in Chalier: Repertoire, 1878, Wagenmann.

HILDEBRAND. See GREGORY VII.

HILDEGARDE, St., b. in the castle of Böckelheim, 1098; was educated in the Benedictine nunnery of Disobodenberg, by Jutta von Sponheim, whom she succeeded as abbess in 1138; and in 1147 the monastery of Rupertenberg, where she died in 1178. She received prophetic visions; and, as these were recognized by the Church, she came gradually to occupy a very exceptional position, and to exercise a very extraordinary influence, in the German Church. She is commemorated on Sept. 17, but she was never canonized. Her writings, Scivias (first printed in Paris, 1513, and Cologne, 1628), Liber Divinorum Operum, Explanatio Regula: S. Benedicti, Physica (nine books), Letters, etc., are found in Migne: Patrologia Latina, Tom. 16, 1877. Her life was written by Stilling, in A. S. Bolli. ad 17 Sept., and by Dahn, Mayendorf, 1852. Complete biographical information is found in Linne: Die Handschr. d. Landesbibliothek Wiesbaden, Wiesbaden, 1877. [See also Richard: Sainte Hildegarde, Aix, 1876.]

HILL, Rowland, an eccentric and popular English preacher; b. at Hawkestone, Aug. 23, 1744; d. in London, April 11, 1833. In 1764 he entered St. John's College, Cambridge, but his university course he came under the influence of Mr. Whitefield and the Methodists. He aroused opposition by preaching without a license, and by
It only requires, however, a careful reading of the stories handed down of Hillel's mental acuteness, to become convinced that he moved in the circle of Pharisaism, and never went beyond the narrow prejudices of his class. He was simply a rabbi (perhaps the best and purest of his order), a man of the school, following precedent; but he was in no sense a reformer for the race, nor do any of his sayings live as sources of power and influence in the world. Over his tomb the words were uttered, "Oh the gentle, the pious, the scholar of Ezra!" They were no doubt appropriate upon it. This has been highly praised, and it is no detraction of its beauty to say that Jesus gave a better summary of the same when he made the statement of its positive requirements (Mark xii. 30). The Talmudic illustrations of Hillel's intellectual adroitness betray, if not a want of veracity, at least the spirit of rabbinism and hair-splitting casuistry which Jesus so fearlessly rebuked. Of those incidents which place him in an unenviable light, the most striking, perhaps, is the one which relates how, at the sacrifice, he passed over an ox for a cow by swinging the animal's tail to and fro, and so concealing its gender.

The centuries have judged both the Jewish rabbi and the world's Redeemer. Hillel, says Delitzsch, "is dead, and has his place as the representative of a system of outlived ceremonies that goes out from him." This has been highly praised, and it is no detraction of its beauty to say that Jesus gave a better summary of the same when he made a statement of its positive requirements (Mark xii. 30). The Talmudic illustrations of Hillel's intellectual adroitness betray, if not a want of veracity, at least the spirit of rabbinism and hair-splitting casuistry which Jesus so fearlessly rebuked. Of those incidents which place him in an unenviable light, the most striking, perhaps, is the one which relates how, at the sacrifice, he passed off an ox for a cow by swinging the animal's tail to and fro, and so concealing its gender.

The centuries have judged both the Jewish rabbi and the world's Redeemer. Hillel, says Delitzsch, "is dead, and has his place as the representative of a system of outlived ceremonies that goes out from him." This has been highly praised, and it is no detraction of its beauty to say that Jesus gave a better summary of the same when he made a statement of its positive requirements (Mark xii. 30). The Talmudic illustrations of Hillel's intellectual adroitness betray, if not a want of veracity, at least the spirit of rabbinism and hair-splitting casuistry which Jesus so fearlessly rebuked. Of those incidents which place him in an unenviable light, the most striking, perhaps, is the one which relates how, at the sacrifice, he passed off an ox for a cow by swinging the animal's tail to and fro, and so concealing its gender.

The centuries have judged both the Jewish rabbi and the world's Redeemer. Hillel, says Delitzsch, "is dead, and has his place as the representative of a system of outlived ceremonies that goes out from him." This has been highly praised, and it is no detraction of its beauty to say that Jesus gave a better summary of the same when he made a statement of its positive requirements (Mark xii. 30). The Talmudic illustrations of Hillel's intellectual adroitness betray, if not a want of veracity, at least the spirit of rabbinism and hair-splitting casuistry which Jesus so fearlessly rebuked. Of those incidents which place him in an unenviable light, the most striking, perhaps, is the one which relates how, at the sacrifice, he passed off an ox for a cow by swinging the animal's tail to and fro, and so concealing its gender.

The centuries have judged both the Jewish rabbi and the world's Redeemer. Hillel, says Delitzsch, "is dead, and has his place as the representative of a system of outlived ceremonies that goes out from him." This has been highly praised, and it is no detraction of its beauty to say that Jesus gave a better summary of the same when he made a statement of its positive requirements (Mark xii. 30). The Talmudic illustrations of Hillel's intellectual adroitness betray, if not a want of veracity, at least the spirit of rabbinism and hair-splitting casuistry which Jesus so fearlessly rebuked. Of those incidents which place him in an unenviable light, the most striking, perhaps, is the one which relates how, at the sacrifice, he passed off an ox for a cow by swinging the animal's tail to and fro, and so concealing its gender.
HINTON, John Howard, b. at Oxford, March 24, 1791; d. at Bristol, Dec. 17, 1873. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh; entered the Baptist ministry, and was for many years one of the most intellectual preachers of London. "He shared with Binney the honor of the designation 'the students' preachers.' His best known work was History and Topography of the United States (1832, American edition, enlarged, N. Y., 1853). Among his theological works may be mentioned The Harmony of Religious Truth and Human Reason (1832), Treatise on Man's Responsibility (1840). There is a complete edition of his works, in seven volumes. —James Hinton, son of Michael, Dec. 24, 1791; d. at Bristol, Dec. 17, 1873. He was the foremost writer; b. in the second half of the second century; d. about the year 240. Greek was his native tongue; and, although this may point to an Oriental birth, he was in Rome at an early age. He heard Irenaeus lecture (Photius). The caesi, Sethites, Justian are treated; in vi., the followers of Simon agus, and Valentinus and Celsus. — See his Life and Letters, London, 1878, 4th ed., 1881.

HIPPO (the present Bona), a Roman colony on the northern coast of Africa; was the seat of two councils (393 and 426), of which the former is the Baptist ministry, and was for many years one of the most interesting, because it gave the first express definition of the New-Testament canon, in the form in which it has ever since been retained. Augustine was bishop there from 396 to 400. See Petit: Voyage à Hippone au commencement du 1er siècle, 6th ed., Paris, 1876.

HIPPOLOYS (400) designates his bishopric as Portus, the port of Rome. Jerome (Cat. Vet. Illust., 61) gives nothing more about him than a few of his writings. An ancient catalogue of Roman bishops, which Mommsen puts in 354, states that Yppolitus presbyter, with the Roman Bishop Pontianus, was banished by Severus to the unhealthy Island of Sardinia (about 235). It does not say that he died there; and so the supposed statement that his death by Prudentius can be harmonized with this statement, but is not corroborated by any other testimony. He says Hippolytus was regarded as a martyr by the Roman Church, and suffered martyrdom at Portus, being torn to pieces by horses. The authenticity of this account is justly denied by Dollinger, on the ground that this mode of punishment was not practised by the Romans. In 1551 a marble statue was exhumed at Portus, which represents Hippolytus in a sitting posture, with beard and high forehead. On the chair are inscribed the titles of his works. — In 1842 a learned Greek, Minoidea Minas, employed by the French Government, found at Mount Athos, and brought to Paris, a number of manuscripts. Among these was one which E. Miller published at Oxford in 1851, under the title Origen's Philoacanthomena; or, Refutation of all Heresies. The first book of this work was known before, and was generally ascribed to Origen. Of the original ten books, the second, third, and a part of the fourth, are still wanting. It is almost universally agreed by critics that this work is by the hand of Hippolytus, and not Origen. Baur (Theol. Jahrb., 1858) regarded the presbyter Caius as the author; but he has no followers in this opinion.

Hippolytus displays in this work wise judgment, large information, a wide acquaintance with the writings of philosophers, and acuteness in bringing out the relation of the ancient philosophies to the Christian heresies. He was as harsh and uncompromising a foe of philosophy as Tertullian. The Refutation of all Heresies (κατα ψευδων ἀληθευῶν θεωρεμ ἡγείτω) is a polemical work whose main object is to refute the doctrines (and especially the secret doctrines) of the Gnostics, and to abash heretics by showing that their views were taken from Pagan philosophy and Oriental theosophy. Book i. gives a summary of the Greek, Druid, and Indian philosophies. Books ii. and iii. are lost. Book iv. begins in the middle of an account of Chaldean astrology, and gives an account of the magic practised at that time, etc. Books v.–x. contain the account of the heresies. In v. the Ophites (Nasiensi, Peratisc, Sethites, Justinus) are treated; in vi., the followers of Simon Magnus, and Valentineus and his disciples; in vii., Basidei (whose views appear to us in an altogether new phase) and Marcion; in viii., the Dokes in Arabia; nolmos, the Quartodeicani, and the Montanists; in ix., Patripassianism, the author giving a valuable picture of the congregation in Rome at that time, and in x. he summarizes the contents of books i. and iv.–ix. It was from this summary that Theodoret drew. From the fact that Hippolytus looks back upon the administration ofCallistus (217–222) as belonging to the past, the date of composition may be assigned pretty confidently to the year 234.
HITTITE.

Johann Trittenheim, abbot of St. Anheim (d. 1516), the Annalee H., at St. Gall, 1690.

The fragments on Daniel, however, edited by Bardenhewer (D. heil. Hippol. Commentar 2. Buch Daniel, Freiburg, 1877), we may confidently regard as genuine.


Hirschau, or Hirsau, a Benedictine monastery, now destroyed, but once very famous, in the diocese of Spires, was founded in 830 by Count Erlafried of Calw, and his son Bishop Notting of Vercelli. The first monks, numbering fifteen, and the first abbot, Lindert, came from Fuld; and the traditions of that flourishing seat of learning seemed to take root at Hirschau. But about a thousand internal dissensions, the avarice of the counts of Calw and the plague, completely ruined the institution. For a century the monastery stood empty, until Leo IX., in 1049, compelled the counts of Calw to re-erect the building, and revive the institution. By its new abbot, Wilhelm der Selige (1069—91), it was brought into a very flourishing condition; and through his Constitutiones Hirsauenses, a close imitation of the Constitutiones Cluniacenses, it exercised a great influence on other German monasteries. During the Reformation it was transformed into a theological seminary, and in 1692 it was destroyed by the French, whose chronicle has been written by Johann Trittenheim, abbot of Spanheim (d. 1516), whose Chronicon H. was printed, Basel, 1559, and the Annales H., at St. Gall, 1890.

Hirschau, Johann Baptist, b. at Altergarten, Württemberg, Jan. 20, 1796; d. at Freiburg, Sept. 4, 1865; was appointed professor of morals and practical theology at Tübingen 1817, and at Freiburg 1837, but retired into private life 1863. In spite of a certain innate, aristocratic conservatism, which prevented him from adopting a truly liberal platform, he belonged to the reform party in the Roman Church, and took an active part in public life both before and after 1848. Several of his books, as, for instance, On the Mass (1821), Die kirchlichen Zustände der Gegenwart (1849), etc., were put on the Index, and he submitted.

Hitchcock, Edward, D.D., LL.D., b. at Deerfield, Mass., May 24, 1793; d. at Amherst, Feb. 27, 1864. He was an eminent scientist, and from 1825 to 1854 was professor in Amherst College, during the last ten of which years he was its president. By his geological labors he won great fame; but his scientific attainments served as proofs of Christianity, and he delighted to present science as the handmaid of religion. Besides strictly professional works, he wrote The Religion of Geology and its Connected Sciences (1851), and Religious Truths Illustrated from Science (1857).

Hittites, The. Sons of Heth, the second son of Canaan. Only scattered references to the Hittites (2 Sm 7) occur in the Old Testament, from which we cannot as later writers did not at the time of their power. Generally, it is only scattered families that are mentioned, like those of Ephon, Ahimelech, or Uriah; or small communities, such as may have led to their being included in the lists so often repeated of the Canaanite tribes. Of these were the families of Elon and Beer, with whom Esau intermarried. In Judg. i. 26, however, the land of the Hittites is at a distance from Palestine; and the same is the case in the history from the time of David. His census extended as far as the Hittites at Kadesh (if we may so correct " Tahtim-Hodshi," 2 Sam. xxiv. 6, as suggested by the LXX. Alex.). Solomon married Hittite women (1 Kings xi. 1); and the kings of the Hittites are mentioned (1 Kings x. 29; 2 Chron. i. 17; 2 Kings vii. 6) as parallel with the kings of Egypt and of Syria. They are the same as the "kings on this side Euphrates" (1 Kings iv. 24).

From the Hebrew Scriptures we could only gather, then, that the Hittites were of a Hamitic race, and regarded as aliens; that, from the time of Abraham to David, they had communities or families in Palestine; and that, from the time of Solomon, they had kings and territory to the north-east of Palestine. Here the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments, with those of the Hittites themselves, discovered within the last few years, greatly add to our knowledge.

The Egyptians called the Hittites "Khita." They appear in the reign of Thothmes III., about 1500 B.C. (Rawlinson), as inhabiting a "green land," but only as one among other peoples. Later they became predominant, and were the chief enemy met by Seti I. and Rameses II.; the former of whom captured their western capital, Kadesh, and the latter who secured a victory over them at the same place (about 1350 B.C.), entered then into a treaty with them, and married the daughter of Khitasar, their king, as described in the poem of Pentaur. The allies of the Hittites are mentioned by Pentaur; and De Rouge identified them as distant as the extreme west of Asia Minor. This is not now credited; although we do know that their influence and arms must have extended, at one time, as far as Smyrna.

The Assyrians knew the Hittites as "Khatti." They appear in the reign of Thothmes III., about 1500 B.C. (Rawlinson), as inhabiting a "green land," but only as one among other peoples. Later they became predominant, and were the chief enemy met by Seti I. and Rameses II.; the former of whom captured their western capital, Kadesh, and the latter who secured a victory over them at the same place (about 1350 B.C.), entered then into a treaty with them, and married the daughter of Khitasar, their king, as described in the poem of Pentaur. The allies of the Hittites are mentioned by Pentaur; and De Rouge identified them as distant as the extreme west of Asia Minor. This is not now credited; although we do know that their influence and arms must have extended, at one time, as far as Smyrna.

The Assyrians knew the Hittites as "Khatti." Like the Egyptians, they regarded them as their chief rivals and most dangerous enemies. They are mentioned by the Babylonian Sargon in the six-
tenth century B.C., before the Assyrian Empire had risen. Tiglath-pileser I. (B.C. 1120) found the Hittites inhabiting the region extending westward and southward from Carchemish, and exercising a wide suzerainty north, almost, if not quite, to the Euxine Sea. His successors were engaged in constant wars with them, until Sargon extinguished the Hittite power by the capture of Carchemish (717 B.C.), and its incorporation into the Assyrian Empire. The Khatti are mentioned by Sennacherib and Esarhaddon; but their name is merely applied to all the peoples of Syria and Phenicia.

The monuments of the Hittites themselves have been identified since 1876, chiefly by the labors of Professor A. H. Sayce. The first known were four hieroglyphic inscriptions from Hamath, first faithfully copied in the Second Statement of the American Palestine Exploration Society in 1873. Since that time Hittite monuments with inscriptions have been found at Carchemish on the east, at Aleppo, at Ibleez in Lycaonia, at Marash, at Boghaz Keui, and Eyuk in the Valley of the Euphrates, and at Boghaz Keui itself. The inscriptionsshow a people generally bearded, with the pointed hat, a loose tunic, and boots turned up at the toes. They prove that the Hittites penetrated and conquered the whole of Asia Minor at a period before any history known to us of that region, and that they possessed a high civilization, such as could construct the famous statue of "Niobe," or Cybele, in Mount Sipylus. It is probable that from them, quite as much as from the Phenicians, the Greeks drew the rudiments of their art; while the Cypriote and Lycian letters, and so the supplemental letters of the Greek alphabet, came very probably from the Hittites. Theirs was the primitive civilization, so far as we know, of Syria, and of Asia Minor from Smyrna to Lake Van.

Their language is not yet certainly known, as their writing is still undeciphered. They were almost certainly not Semitic, as the hundreds of names that have come to us, except a few in the late Umbrit's successor from Hittite, Phenician and Hebrew neighbours, do not easily yield a Semitic etymology. Such Scripture names as Ephron, Zohar, Joram, Uriah, Elon, Beeri, Judith, and Basemath, are plainly Semitic, and may be either adopted or translated names; but such names as Khita and king of Helbon? (king of Khita and king of Helbon?), with the word "sar" (if it means king; which is a loan word, and not originally Semitic) following its noun, show a non-Semitic construction. It is, besides, difficult to see how a really inflecting language could invent or use syllabic characters. It is probable that the Hittites had their origin in the mountainous region of Central and Eastern Asia Minor, and spoke a Proto-Armenian or Alarodian language.

Of their religion we know little. Ashima is mentioned (2 Kings xvii. 90) as a god of Hamath. At Ibleez we have a figure of the great Hittite god, Sandan,—a god of agriculture. At Boghaz Keui are found nearly twenty figures of male and female deities. The Syrian god Adad, or Hadad, may have been originally Hittite. With the softened aspirate we seem to have the name in Hado-ram, son of King Toi of Hamath, another form of whose name is given (2 Sam. viii. 10) as Joram; the writer in 1 Chron. xviii. 10 choosing a form meaning Adad is exalted, rather than one meaning Jehovah is exalted. It is remarkable, however, that, on the Assyrian monuments, the element Jehovah enters into the name of the King Jau-bihlid, who is also called In-bihid. This, however, belongs to a late period, when the Syrians were replacing the Hittites.

LIT. — WILLIAM HAYES WARD: The Hamath Inscriptions, in Second Statement of the Palestine Exploration Society, 1873 (this paper is accompanied by careful facsimiles); F. LENORMANT: Sceaux à légendes en écriture hamathéenne, in Revue Archéologique, October, 1873 (an acute but futile attempt to find a clue to the character on some seals brought from Koyunjik); A. H. SAYCE: The Hamathite Inscriptions, in Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archæology, vol. v. pt. 1, 1876; the name: The Monuments of the Hittites, and The Bilingual Hittite and Cuneiform Inscription of Tar-kondemos, ib., vol. vii. pt. 2, 1881; letters in The Academy, Aug. 16 and Nov. 1, 1879, Aug. 21, 1880; also The Decipherment of the Hittite Inscriptions, in The Independent, New York, Ma., 16, 1882. See also E. SCHAEDEL: Keltenschriften un. Geschichtsforschung, pp. 221-238; F. DELITZSCH: Wo lag das Paradies, pp. 263-280; T. K. CHEYNE: Hittites, in Encyc. Brit., vol. xii. pp. 25-27; W. ST. CHAD BOSCAWEN: Carchemish the Capital of the Hittites, in The Independent, New York, April 28 and May 5, 1881. HITZIG, Ferdinand, a learned and bold exegete and critic of the Old Testament; the son of a rationalistic preacher; was b. at Hauingen in Baden, June 23, 1807; d. at Heidelberg, Jan. 22, 1875. He pursued the study of theology at Heidelberg under Paulus, at Halle under Gesenius, and at Göttingen under Ewald, to whom he afterwards dedicated his Isaiah as the "founder of a new science of the Hebrew language and Old Testament exegesis." In 1830 he became docent at Heidelberg; and in 1832 was called to Zurich, where he remained till 1851, when he was chosen professor at Heidelberg. At Zurich Hitzig publicly announced himself in favor of calling Strauss. He was a man on the one hand without fear or hypocrisy, and on the other of a polemical temperament and caustic wit, which seemed to exclude personal piety and gentleness. Notwithstanding this, he was a man of noble nature, and not only loved the Old Testament, but sought to serve the kingdom of God by his
investigations. He enjoyed the esteem of his colleagues and friends. We can adopt the words of Keim, in the dedication of his History of Jesus (January, 1875, 2d ed., etc.): “To the memory of F. Hitzig, the honest man without fear, the faithful friend without deceit, the pride of Zurich and Heidelberg, the bold, restless architect of biblical science.”

As an exegete and critic Hitzig was distinguished by untiring industry, acute penetration, uncorruptible love of truth, and thorough scholarship. He often succeeded, as in the department of textual criticism; but the number of confident but untenable assertions preponderate. "The Commentaries on Isaiah is his best work. We agree with Hupfeld, that the translation shows the hand of a master, but with him must regret the author’s failure “to understand the religious spirit of the prophet, and his apparent resolution to detect the most improbable, and to overlook the most natural sense.” This is especially true of the second part of The Psalms (Heidelberg, new and enlarged edition, 1863-65), wherein the author, in all earnestness, not only puts the larger number of the psalms in the century just before Christ, but gives the circumstances under which each was written as exactly as though he could hear the grass growing under his feet (Bleek: Einl. ins A. T., p. 619). In 1869-70 the History of the People of Israel appeared (Leipzig). It comes down to 72 B.C.; but it was not the author’s intention to give a history of the religion of Israel. Its assumptions are, as might be expected, numerous and arbitrary. The sojourn in the wilderness, for example, is put down at four years. He hazarded many conjectures where none were needed. In 1855 Ewald espied in his old pupil a real intellectual brother of Hengstenberg.

It was a want of what the English call common sense which prevented this gifted and truth-loving investigator to such a remarkable degree from becoming an exemplary exegete and a trustworthy historian. Ewald was fully justified when he complained that Hitzig made that which was incredible manner, declared the first nine chapters of Isaiah inerrant, and his works will for a long time remain a fountain of quickening to many.

HIVITE. See CANAAN.

HOADLY, Benjamin, a distinguished Low-Church divine and controversial writer of the Church of England; b. at Westerham, Kent, Nov. 14, 1675; d. at Auburn, Sept. 10, 1830. He was a student and fellow of Catherine College, Cambridge; became rector of St. Peter-le-Poer, London, 1704, and Streatham, 1710; Bishop of Bangor, 1715; was soon translated to Hereford, to Salisbury (1729), and to Winchester (1734). Hoadly was one of the most able and influential prelates of the eighteenth century, and one of the earliest representatives of the principle of ecclesiastical toleration in the Church of England after the Restoration (1660). He was a typical Broad or Low Churchman. His name is more intimately associated than any other with the so-called “Bangorian Controversy,” which engaged the pens of fifty writers, some of them, like Law and Sherlock, among the ablest of their day, and produced an intense excitement among all classes. It arose from a sermon preached by Hoadly in 1717 from John xvii. 36 (“My kingdom is not of this world”); in which he declared for political toleration irrespective of church connection, and asserted, as against the crown and clergy, that Christ was the only authoritative lawgiver, etc., in the Church. He deprecated in the strongest language “men’s suffering in their temporal rights upon account of any differences in those points in which the reason of mankind permits them to differ” (Preface to The Canonical Rights of Subjects). This sermon was brought up for consideration in convocation (1717); and its discussion threatened to lead to such disastrous consequences, that the body was prorogued by the crown, and did not sit again till 1822. Hoadly’s chief work on this controversy was his Common Rights of Subjects defended; and the Nature of the Sacramental Test considered: an Answer to Dr. Sherlock’s Indication of the Corporation and Test Acts, London, 1719. Among his other writings were an Essay on Miracles (1702), A Brief Vindication of the Ancient Prophets (1708), and Sermons (2 vols., 1754-55). Collected edition of his works, with a Life, in 3 vols., London, 1773. See also STOUGH: Religion in England, v. 412 sqq.

HOBART, John Henry, Protestant-Episcopal Bishop of New York; b. in Philadelphia, Sept. 14, 1776; d. at Auburn, Sept. 10, 1830. He graduated at Princeton 1793, and was tutor there from 1796 to 1798. After holding several parishes, he became assistant minister of Trinity, New York, assistant bishop of the diocese of New York 1811, and bishop in 1816. He took a deep interest in the General Theological Seminary, New-York City, and was made professor of pastoral theology and pulpit eloquence in 1821. In 1823 he traveled in Europe on account of his health, and was one of the first Protestants to preach in Rome. He was a zealous advocate of episcopal ordination, and engaged in a controversy with Dr. John M. Mason (Presbyterian) of New York on that subject. He was a student and fellow of Catherine College, Cambridge; became rector of St. Peter-le-Poer, London, 1704, and Streatham, 1710; Bishop of Bangor, 1715; was soon translated to Hereford, to Salisbury (1729), and to Winchester (1734). His name is more intimately associated than any other with the so-called “Bangorian Controversy,” which engaged the pens of fifty writers, some of them, like Law and Sherlock, among the ablest of their day, and produced an intense excitement among all classes. It arose from a sermon preached by Hoadly in 1717 from John xvii. 36 (“My kingdom is not of this world”); in which he declared for political toleration irrespective of church connection, and asserted, as against the crown and clergy, that Christ was the only authoritative lawgiver, etc., in the Church. He deprecated in the strongest language “men’s suffering in their temporal rights upon account of any differences in those points in which the reason of mankind permits them to differ” (Preface to The Canonical Rights of Subjects). This sermon was brought up for consideration in convocation (1717); and its discussion threatened to lead to such disastrous consequences, that the body was prorogued by the crown, and did not sit again till 1822. Hoadly’s chief work on this controversy was his Common Rights of Subjects defended; and the Nature of the Sacramental Test considered: an Answer to Dr. Sherlock’s Indication of the Corporation and Test Acts, London, 1719. Among his other writings were an Essay on Miracles (1702), A Brief Vindication of the Ancient Prophets (1708), and Sermons (2 vols., 1754-55). Collected edition of his works, with a Life, in 3 vols., London, 1773. See also STOUGH: Religion in England, v. 412 sqq.
HOBBES, Thomas, b. at Malmesbury, in Wiltshire, April 5, 1588; d. at Hardwick Hall, in Devonshire, Dec. 4, 1679. He was educated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, and spent the first part of his life, up to 1637, as tutor in various noble families, often travelling on the Continent with his pupils, and the last, after 1637, in a comprehensive and vigorous literary activity, first in Paris (1641—32), then in London, or in the country with the Hardwick family. His principal works are Elementa Philosophica de Cive (1642), Human Nature and De Corpore Politico (1650), Leviathan (1651, new ed., Oxford, 1881, London, 1882), Liberty and Necessity (1654), etc. His moral and political works were first collected in 1750; all his works in 1839-45, by Molesworth.

The Vita Hobbiame Auctorium gives full information concerning early editions, translations, etc. The philosophical stand-point of Hobbes may be described as an application to the study of man of the method and principles of the study of nature; and the results of this process were a psychology and a morals utterly antagonistic, not only to Christianity, but to religion in general. Psychology I and a morals utterly antagonistic, not unfrequently, that the materialistic psychology and utilitarian morals of to-day return to his writings, and adopt some modification of his paradoxes. There is no comprehensive monograph on Hobbes. See the art. by G. Croom Robertson, in Encyclopaedia Britannica.

HOCHMANN, Ernst Christof, surnamed Hochennau, b. 1670; d. 1721; studied law at Halle, but was relegated from the university on account of his participation in the extravagances of the Pietists. In 1697 he entered into relation with Arnold and Dippel, and repaired to Francfort with the aim of converting the Jews. But riots arose; and he retired to the estates of Count Wittgenstein, the refuge of all separatists and mystics. From 1700 to 1721 he wandered about, preaching in public, conducting worship in private, denouncing the lukewarmness of the clergy, etc. He was often arrested,—at Detmold 1702, Hanover 1703, Nuremberg 1708-09, Halle 1711, etc.; but he found also many adherents, especially at Crefeld, Duisburg, Mülheim, Wesel, Emmerich, and other places in the Rhine-region. Full account of his views, influence, writings, etc., is found in M. Göbel: Geschichte des christlichen Lebens in der rhein-westf. Kirche, Coblenz, 1852, vol. ii.

HOGAN, Richard J., LL.D., of Scotch-Irish ancestry on his father's side, and through his mother related to the French Huguenots; b. Dec. 18, 1797, in Philadelphia, where his grandfather, a Christian merchant from the north of Ireland, had settled in 1735, and where his father, a godly man, settled in 1758; his brother of his mother was only six months old; d. in Princeton, N.J., June 18, 1878. He matriculated at the College of New Jersey in 1812, and after graduation entered in 1816 the theological seminary in Princeton, having among his classmates his two life-long friends,—John Johns, afterwards bishop of Virginia, and Charles P. McElvaine, afterwards bishop of Ohio. In 1822 he was appointed by the General Assembly professor of biblical and oriental literature. In 1822 he married Sarah Bache, great-grand-daughter of Benjamin Franklin. Soon after, he went abroad (1825-28) to prosecute special studies, and in Paris, Halle, and Berlin attended the lectures of De Sacy, Tholuck, Hengstenberg, and Neander. In 1825 he founded the Biblical Repository and Princeton Review, and during forty years was its editor, and the principal contributor to its pages. He received the degree of D.D. from Rutgers College in 1834, and that of LL.D. from Washington College, Pennsylvania, in 1844. In 1840 Dr. Hodge was transferred to the chair of didactic theology, retaining still, however, the department of New Testament exegesis, the duties of which he continued to discharge until his death. He was moderator of the General Assembly in 1846. Fifty years of his professoriate were completed in 1872, and the event was most impressively celebrated on the 25th of April. A large concourse, including four hundred of his own pupils, assembled to do him honor. Representative of the different theological institutes, at home and abroad, mingled their congratulations with those of his colleagues; and letters expressing deepest sympathy with the occasion came from distinguished men in all quarters of the land and from across the sea. Dr. Hodge enjoyed what President Woolsey, at the jubilee just referred to, hoped he might enjoy,—"a sweet old age." He lived in the midst of his children and grandchildren; and, when the last moment came, they gathered round him. "Dearest," said he to a beloved daughter, "don't weep. To be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord. To be with the Lord is to see him. To see the Lord is to be like him." Of the children who survive him, three are ministers of the gospel; and two of these succeed him in the faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary, —Dr. C. W. Hodge, in the department of exegetical theology, and Dr. A. A. Hodge, in that of dogmatics. The latter wrote his father's biography (1880).

Dr. Hodge was a voluminous writer, and from the beginning to the end of his theological career his pen was never idle. In 1835 he published his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, his greatest exegetical work, and one of the most masterly commentaries on this Epistle that has ever been written. Other works followed at intervals of longer or shorter duration,—Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, 1840; Way of Life, 1841, republished in England, translated into other languages, and circulated to the extent of thirty-five thousand copies in America; Commentary on Ephesians, 1856; on First Corinthians, 1857; on Second Corinthians, 1859. His magnum opus is the Systematic Theology (1871-73), of 3 vols. 8vo, and extending to 2269 pages. His last book, What is Darwinism? appeared in 1874. In addition to all this he is remembered that he contributed upwards of one hundred and thirty articles to the Princeton Review, many of which, besides exerting a powerful influence at the time of their publication, have since been gathered into volumes, and as Princeton Essays, Hodge's Essays (1857), and Hodge's Discourses in Church Polity (ed. Rev. William Durant,
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1878), have taken a permanent place in our theological literature.

This record of Dr. Hodge's literary life is suggestive of the great influence that he exerted. But, if we would properly estimate that influence, we must remember that three thousand ministers of the gospel passed under his instruction, and that to him was accorded the rare privilege, during a course of sixty years, of achieving distinction as a teacher, exegete, preacher, controversialist, ecclesiastic, and systematic theologian. As a teacher he had few equals; and, if he did not display popular gifts in the pulpit, he revealed homiletical powers of a high order in the "conferences" on sabbath afternoons, where he spoke with his accustomed clearness and logical precision, but with great spontaneity, and amazing tenderness and unction.

Dr. Hodge's literary powers were seen at their best in his contributions to the Princeton Review, many of which are acknowledged masterpieces of controversial writing. They cover a wide range of topics, from the apologetic questions that concern our common Christianity, to questions of ecclesiastical administration, in which only Presbyterians have been supposed to take interest. But the questions in debate among American theologians during the period covered by Dr. Hodge's life, belonged, for the most part, to the departments of anthropology and soteriology; and it was upon these, accordingly, that his polemic powers were mainly employed.

Though always honorable in debate, we should nevertheless not be likely to have a correct idea of his character, if we judged him only by the polemic relations in which his writings reveal him. Controversy does not emphasize the amiable side of a man's nature. Dr. Hodge was a man of warm affection, of generous impulses, and of John-like piety. Devotion to Christ was the salient characteristic of his experience, and it was the test by which he judged the experience of others. Hence, though a Presbyterian and a Calvinist, his sympathies went far beyond the narrow views of church polity which some of his brethren advocated. He repudiated the unchristian controversy of those who denied the validity of Roman-Catholic baptism. He gave his sympathy to all agencies. He was conservative by nature, and his life was spent in defending the Reformed theology as set forth in the Westminster symbols. He was fond of saying that Princeton had never originated a new idea; but this meant no more than that Princeton was the advocate of historical Calvinism in opposition to the modified and provincial Calvinism of a later day. And it is true that Dr. Hodge must be classed among the great defenders of the faith, rather than among the great constructive minds of the Church. He had no ambition to be epoch-making by marking the era of a new departure. But he has earned a higher title to fame, in that he was the champion of his Church's faith during a long and active life, her trusted leader in time of trial, and for more than half a century the most conspicuous teacher of her ministry. The garnered wisdom of his life is given us in his Systematic Theology, the greatest system of dogmatics in our language. FRANCIS L. PATTON.

HODY, Humphrey, b. at Odcombe, Somersetshire, Jan. 1, 1659; d. at Oxford, Jan. 20, 1706. In 1684 he became fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, in 1698 Regius Professor of Greek, and in 1704 archdeacon of Oxford. In reward of his support of the ruling party in their treatment of the bishops, who had been deprived for refusing to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary, he was, of achieving distinction as a teacher, exegete, preacher, controversialist, ecclesiastic, and systematic theologian. But he lives as author of a classic work, De bibiliorum textibus originalibus versionibus Gracae et Latina Vulgata, libri iv., Oxford, 1705.

HOFACKER, Ludwig and Wilhelm, two brothers of rare piety and ministerial usefulness. Their father was pastor and dekan in Stuttgart. Ludwig was b. at Wildbad, April 15, 1798; was vicar in Stuttgart, and d. Nov. 18, 1828, as pastor in Rielingshausen, Württemberg, after a short ministry of four years, and with the words "Saviour, Saviour!" Wilhelm was b. in Grättingen, Feb. 18, 1806; pastor at Waiblingen 1833, and of St. Leonard's Church, Stuttgart, 1835, where he d. Aug. 10, 1848, "a prince of God, with words of eternal life on his lips." Thousands flocked to hear both the brothers. The former appeared directly to the conscience; destroying the sinner's confidence in the righteousness of works, and presenting the atonement by Christ's blood as the only hope of the soul. He said, "I attack souls as with the approach of a storm." He was a popular orator, who is sometimes startling, but always rugged, positive, and powerful. Wilhelm likewise preached only on the fundamental themes of grace and guilt, but his rhetoric was more artistic and finished than his brother's. The former, those who would rather drink from a fresh, rushing, forest-brook; the latter, those who would rather kneel at the clear, placid, deep waters of a lovely lake. The Hofackers exerted a lasting influence upon the religious life of Württemberg, and thousands of copies of their sermons have been distributed.

LIT. — LUDWIG HOFACKER: Predigten (Stuttgart), and Life by A. KNAPP (Heidelberg, 27th ed., 1866); WILHELM HOFACKER: Predigten (Stuttgart, 2d ed., 1857), and Life by his son L. HOFACKER (Stuttgart, 1872).

HOFFMANN, Andreas Gottlieb, b. at Wellебingen, near Magdeburg, April 13, 1706; d. at Jena, March 16, 1764; studied theology at Halle, more especially Oriental languages, under Gesenius, and was appointed professor of theology at Jena in 1781. His principal works are Grammatica Sacra, Halle, 1827, twice translated into Eng-
lish by Day and Harris Cowper; and Evoueur d. hebräischen Alterthümer, Weimar, 1832.

Hoffmann, Ludwig Friedrich Wilhelm, court-preacher in Berlin, and general-superintendent of Brandenburg; b. Oct. 30, 1806, in Leonberg, Württemberg, the birthplace of Schelling and Paulus; d. of heart-disease, Aug. 28, 1873, in Berlin. His father was a thoughtful pietist, and founder of the religious colony of Kornthal (1819). His brother Christoph was the originator of a movement for the colonization of Palestine. After passing through a theological course at Tübingen, where he had David Strauss for a fellow student, he became vicar of Heumaden, and in 1834 pastor in Stuttgart. In 1839 he was made superintendent of the Institution for Missions in Basel. There he remained for twelve years, giving himself up with great enthusiasm to his duties and the study of the history of missions. During this period he published a number of volumes under the titles Ruf zum Herrn (Berlin, 1854—58), D. Posaune Deutschlands (1861—63), etc. See Leben u. Wirken d. Dr. Hoffmann, by his son, Berlin, 1878—80, 2 vols. RUDOLF KÖGEL.

Hoffmann, Melchior, one of the most prominent Anabaptist leaders, a founder of society; was b. at Hall in Suabia; worked in Livonia when the Reformation reached those regions; threw himself with the native enthusiasm of his character into the movement; began to preach, met with great opposition; repaired to Wittenberg (1529), and returned with recommendations from Luther; caused great excitement in Dorpat and Reval, and was finally expelled from the country. On his return to Germany he was well coldly received by the Reformers, but obtained, nevertheless, an appointment as preacher at Kiel, in Holstein, 1527. Soon after, however, he began an attack on Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper. A commission was formed to investigate matters; and he was convicted of heresy, and expelled from Holstein 1529. His divergence from Luther made him at first well received at Strassburg, but it soon became apparent that he inclined towards the Anabaptists. He began to publish prophecies, and soon placed himself openly at the head of the party. In Emden he caused sore disturbances in 1538; and on his return to Strassburg he was arrested, and kept in prison for the rest of his life. He probably died in 1542. See lives by Herrmann, Strassb., 1852 [ZUR LINDEN, Leiden, 1885].

Höffling, Johann Wilhelm Friedrich, b. at Drossenfeld, near Bayreuth, 1802; d. in Munich, April 5, 1853; studied theology at Erlangen, 1819—23, and was appointed pastor of St. Jobst, near Nuremberg, 1827; professor of theology at Erlangen, 1837; and member of the consistory in Munich, 1839. His principal works are Das Sakrament der Taufe (1846—48, 2 vols.) and Grundsätze evangelisch-lutherischer Kirchenverfassung (1850), occasioned by the movement of 1848, which also called forth a debate of the question of church constitution. His Liturgisches Urkundebuch (1854) was published after his death, by Thomasius and Harnack. HERZOG.

Hoffmann, Johann Chr. Karl, afterwards honored by Bavaria with the title von Hofmann; was b. Dec. 21, 1810, in Nürnberg, where, under the tutelage of a poor but pious mother, he was trained up in profound respect for religion; d. Dec. 20, 1877, in Erlangen. In 1827 he went to the university of Erlangen, and in 1829 to Berlin, walking on foot. Hegel, Schleiermacher, Neander, and Hengstenberg were lecturing side by side at the time. But Hoffmann gave himself up almost exclusively to historical studies, under the influence of Schleiermacher, and, after spending several years at the gymnasium in Erlangen, he became repetent at the university, and in 1835 writes: "The more I occupy myself with Scripture exegesis, the more powerfully am I convinced of the certainty that the divine Word is one single work, and the more am I stimulated with the glad hope that we generate in our hearts the victory of the truth of inspiration... . It is a sheer impossibility that the prophecies of the
prophets and apostles are false, while their dogmas are true; for here form and contents, fact and doctrine, are one; and this is the distinguishing characteristic of revealed truth. . . . I pray God to permit me to see the Christ, now crucified by His enemies, uplifted by Himself, that I may place my hands in the print of the nails, and mark how He becomes in the glory of His victory, whom I have heretofore loved in the humility of His conflict and suffering." In 1841 he was made professor at Erlangen, a new period of prosperity for the university dating from that time. While at Rostock he took a deep interest in ecclesiastical matters, laboring zealously with Karsten, Wichern, and others, in the interest of missions. He was also interested in political affairs, and represented Erlangen and Fürth at several sessions of the Bavarian Parliament.

Among Hofmann's first publications were two historical works, Gesch. d. Auführkrs in d. Sieve- nen (1837) and Weltgesch. f. Gymnasten (1839, 2d ed. 1839). His first effort in Theology was D. 70 Jahre d. Jeremias u. d. 70 Jahrwochen d. Daniel (1838). The 70 weeks of Daniel he counts in the order 62+1+7 (see Daniel). The 62 extend from 695 to 171 B.C.; the single week, from 171 to 164. The other 7 mark the intervening period before Christ's coming. Weissagung u. Erfüllung im A. u. N. Test. (1841-44) appeared at a time when two views of prophecy prevailed. Hengstenberg petrified it into simple prediction; speculative criticism dissipated it into presentiment, and placed the prophecies after events. Hofmann brought prophecy into closest connection with history, and treated it as an organic whole. History itself is prophecy; and each period contains the germ of the future, and prefigures it. The entire scriptural history is a prophecy of the final and eternal relation between God and man. The incarnation marks the beginning of the fulfillment; for Christ is the new man, the antitype of the old: but it is only the beginning of this fulfillment; for the head is only the realization of the intended perfect communion with God, when it is joined with the body of believers. Prophecy in the Old Testament becomes ever richer and richer in its forms, but points only to one goal,—the God-man. He is then, in turn, the starting-point for new prophecy and hope; his appearance being the prefiguration of the final glorification of the church of believers. The permanent worth of this work consists in the proof that the Old and New Testaments are parts of a single history of salvation; displaying the gradual realization, by divine interpositions, of redemption for the race.

Hofmann's second great work, D. Schriftbeweis (1852-56, 2 vols., 2d ed., 1857-60), is an attempt to prove the authenticity and divine origin of Christianity from its records. He tampered with the usual method of doing this from single passages of Scripture; and himself sought to use the biblical record in its entirety, as one organic whole. He started from the idea, that, to understand Christianity, it was not necessary to describe religious experiences, nor rehearse the doctrines of the Scriptures and the Church, but to develop the simple fact that makes us Christians, or the communion of God with man, mediated by Christ. Herein he differs fundamentally from Schleiermacher, who starts out from the sense of absolute dependence in the Christian's experience. Hofmann starts with the new birth. The results of that new birth are the attributes of Christianity, and were different. With Hofmann, all is historical; with Schleiermacher, nothing. This work aroused opposition. The author had denied the doctrine of vicarious atonement, and the charge was made against him of denying the atonement altogether. To this he replied in Schriftzüchen (1856-59).

Hofmann's other works were D. heil. Schrifl. N. T.'s (1862-81, 9 parts), Theol. Ethik (1875), Vermischte Aufsätze (Erlangen, 1878), Encyklopädie der Theologie (1879), and Biblische Hervorhebt (1880), both published in Nordlingen.

HOFMANN, Johannes, whose true name was Wagner, hence his learned colleagues called him sometimes Economus (a translation of the first-mentioned name), or Carpentarius (a translation of the last). He was in 1841 sent by the magistrature to Basel, to have his orthodoxy examined and verified. As the examination did not result in the certificate needed, Hofmeister went to Zürich, where he became Zugli's trusted collaborator, and pastor of the Fraumünster. In 1528 he went for a short time to Rüfenach; for Christ is the new man, the antitype of the old: but it is only the beginning of this fulfillment; for the head is only the realization of the intended perfect communion with God, when it is joined with the body of believers. Prophecy in the Old Testament becomes ever richer and richer in its forms, but points only to one goal,—the God-man. He is then, in turn, the starting-point for new prophecy and hope; his appearance being the prefiguration of the final glorification of the church of believers. The permanent worth of this work consists in the proof that the Old and New Testaments are parts of a single history of salvation; displaying the gradual realization, by divine interpositions, of redemption for the race.

HOFMANN, Johannes, whose true name was Wagner, hence his learned colleagues called him sometimes Economus (a translation of the first-mentioned name), or Carpentarius (a translation of the last). He was in 1841 sent by the magistrature to Basel, to have his orthodoxy examined and verified. As the examination did not result in the certificate needed, Hofmeister went to Zürich, where he became Zugli's trusted collaborator, and pastor of the Fraumünster. In 1528 he went for a short time to Rüfenach; for Christ is the new man, the antitype of the old: but it is only the beginning of this fulfillment; for the head is only the realization of the intended perfect communion with God, when it is joined with the body of believers. Prophecy in the Old Testament becomes ever richer and richer in its forms, but points only to one goal,—the God-man. He is then, in turn, the starting-point for new prophecy and hope; his appearance being the prefiguration of the final glorification of the church of believers. The permanent worth of this work consists in the proof that the Old and New Testaments are parts of a single history of salvation; displaying the gradual realization, by divine interpositions, of redemption for the race.
duced was enormous; but the police interfered, and the Pope dared not recognize the miracles. In 1826 he quietly retired to a canonry in Gross-warden in Hungary. In 1844 he was made bishop in partibus. In 1848 he was expelled from Hungary by the revolutionists. See his life by A. FEUERBACH and by SCHEKOLD, treating at length the question of the miraculous cures, the one pro, the other contra.

HOLBACH, Paul Heinrich Dietrich, Baron d', b. at Heidelsheim, in the Palatinate, 1723; d. at his estate of Grundval, Jan. 21, 1798; lived mostly in Paris, and acquired a kind of celebrity by gathering around his table the "philosophers" of that time, and by writing, or causing to be written, some of the most characteristic books of the age. As those books were printed in foreign countries, and published anonymously, the authorship is in many cases doubtful. The most remarkable of them is the Système de la nature, and digomnch harm by penetrating into the lower social classes. Le christianisme dicoîet, L'imposture sacrétaire, L'esprit du clerge, etc., are of less importance. WAGENMANN.

HOLINESS. See SANCTIFICATION.

HOLINESS OF GOD is, as Quenstedt substantially defined it, God's perfect and essential purity, and freedom from all defect and blemish (summa omnisque labis expera in Deo puritas). The Hebrew word [טֹּחַ] ("holy," "to make holy") etymologically referred, not to the moral but the material nature; but there are no instances of its use in the latter sense. It was only used in the department of religion among the Hebrews; and, although the application of the term to the external relations of persons and things to religious purposes is the oldest, it is undeniable that the word derived its meaning alone from the idea of God which prevailed in the Old Testament. The term seems to come from [טֹּח], which suggests the notion of separation, and especially separation of that which is defective or diseased. The latter is the meaning of the Assyrian kadištu. This word is defective or diseased. The latter is the meaning of the Assyrian kadištu. This word is found in an Assyrian oath (see Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia, II. p. 17) at the side of its Sumerian equivalent μυγ, which is compounded of δη and γας ("diseased").

The central idea of holiness is not unapproachable, or exaltation above the earth, as Schultz thinks (A. T. Theologie, p. 517); nor is it an aesthetic quality, and synonymous with the glory which surrounds Jehovah in his revelation to Israel (Dan. Theol. d. Propheta, pp. 189 sqq.). God is glorious because he is holy (Exod. xv. 11); and his glory is only the outward expression, as it were, of his holiness. Holiness is absolute freedom from evil and all defect, absolute perfection of life, especially of ethical life (Oehler). God is said to be holy, not in such a way as to exclude all other beings from holiness, but because he is so in a peculiar manner (1 Sam. li. 2). Absolute holiness is an essential attribute of his nature. It is from this centre that the ideas of his unapproachable, incomparableness, and glory irradiate.

Special objects and rites were by the law of Sinai invested with the quality of holiness. God likewise desires men to be holy, and is himself approachable for all such as he calls and sanctifies (1 Sam. vi. 20; Ps. xxvii. 3, etc.): his holiness is no barrier to them. His Spirit is called holy, because its work is to awaken and promote religious life in the soul (Ps. exlil. 10); and the fallen and penitent man of God beseeches that it may not be taken away from him (Ps. li. 11). Human holiness in the New Testament is represented as starting at the centre of man's being,—his heart,—and as extending outwards to his acts and words. The representation of the Old Testament represents it as starting at the surface (Deut. xiv. 21), and penetrating inwards to the heart. That of the Old Testament is more ceremonial, but by no means exclusively so. The law also made the holiness of Israel conditional on obedience to the divine will (Exod. xix. 5 sq.; Lev. xx. 7 sq.), that is, upon a moral qualification; and the exhortations of the Old Testament are everywhere based upon moral considerations and a moral aim. See the Theologies of the Old Testament, of SCHULTZ and OEHLEL (and the discussion of the subject under Attributes, in the works on systematic theology).

HOLLAND. The inhabitants possess full religious liberty. All the adherents of the different creeds have equal civil and political rights and privileges, and enjoy entire freedom of administration in every thing relating to their religion and its exercise. The various denominations, which were avowed by the constitution of 1815, are subsidized by the State. The total thus expended in 1883 was about eight hundred thousand dollars. In the north-east the Protestants preponderate; in the south, the Roman Catholics; while in the central provinces both are fairly represented. In the last fifty years there has been amid the entire population a slight but steady increase in the proportion of Protestants and Jews, and a corresponding decrease of Roman Catholics.

The census which follows is that of the year 1879; but in some of the following paragraphs, figures of a later date have been obtained, and are so stated.

By the authorities the population is classified thus as regards religion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Congregations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-Dutch Reformed</td>
<td>2,180,890</td>
<td>1,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walloons</td>
<td>9,789</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remonstrants</td>
<td>9,578</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Reformed</td>
<td>139,000</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptists</td>
<td>50,706</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Lutherans</td>
<td>61,635</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Lutherans</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moravians</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Episcopalians</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotch Church</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Presbyterian</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Protestants</td>
<td>2,409,614</td>
<td>1,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>1,420,137</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Catholics</td>
<td>4,201</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Church</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Dutch Jews</td>
<td>78,075</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese Jews</td>
<td>3,519</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,012,963</td>
<td>3,744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. THE PROTESTANT CHURCHES. (a) The Netherlands Reformed. — In 1617 Carleton, the English ambassador, stated, that, in Olden Barne-
The Reformed Church (1884) numbers 1,345 congregations, with 1,611 ministers. Twenty years ago there were about two hundred candidates for the ministry at command for vacant charges; while now candidates are lacking for more than 290 vacancies. The congregations are divided into a hundred and eighty smaller circles, or "Ringe," and into forty-four large circles, or "Classes." These classes constitute ten provincial bodies, to which is added an eleventh, called the "Walloon Commission." The organization culminates in the synod, which consists of nineteen members, thirteen ministers, and six elders, who are named by the provincial authorities, who, in turn, are chosen by the classes. The classical assemblies are the characteristic feature of the organism. They meet yearly for the election of officers and the consideration of such matters as are laid before them by the synod; and while, in the other assemblies, the ministers are twice as many as the elders, the classes are composed of all the ministers in their bounds, and an equal number of elders. The local congregation is governed by the consistory, which consists of an equal number of elders and deacons. Since 1867, in most cases, these, as well as the minister, are chosen by a college of representatives; these representatives being themselves chosen by the whole body of adult members, excepting such as are supported by the poor-funds of the church. This direct participation of the people in elections has in most of the churches, especially in the large cities, placed the power in the hands of the orthodox.

The management of the church property was in like manner directed by decrees of King William I., issued in 1819 and 1823; but these were reversed in October, 1869; and since that time most of the congregations have placed themselves under a general "Committee of Control," while the rest are altogether autonomous, and enjoy a so-called free administration.

From the beginning of the Reformation, the ministers were trained at the State universities, where theological faculties had been formed for this purpose. Although almost all candidates for the ministry took this method of preparation, it was not positively obligatory. The most recent law concerning the universities (in 1877) has released the professors from the duty of teaching the theology of the confessions; while in each university two professors, named by the synod of the Reformed Church, are charged with the duty of lecturing on dogmatic and practical theology. In 1883 the three State universities (Leyden, Utrecht, and Groningen), and that of the city of Amsterdam, the Netherlands, together contained two hundred and twenty-eight students of theology.

Neither foreign nor domestic missions are carried on by the Church or its officers as such. And although the work finds little sympathy amid the growing materialism of the people, still, in later years, it has shown considerable activity,
notwithstanding the divisions that prevail; which divisions, however, prevent the possibility of complete and accurate statistics. Besides the Moravian Society, which labored in the West Indies, there was until 1859 only the Netherlandish Missionary Society, which was founded in 1797. Now there are ten societies which send missionaries to the heathen and the Mohammedans, and one which confines itself to the Jews. In the year 1883 the receipts of these amounted to three hundred and fifty thousand gulden; and they employed a hundred and fifty-two missionaries, of whom sixty-six belonged to the Moravians, and twenty-five to the Rhenish union. The church-members are about a thousand, and two hundred schools are attended by fourteen thousand scholars.

The public schools are "confessionless;" but there are hundreds of private schools, supported by Roman Catholics and Protestants, which base their teaching on Christianity. There are two considerable associations formed—one in 1860, the other in 1868—for the purpose of supporting and extending these schools. Evangelistic work is carried on by several associations of believers, who together have forty-five preachers in the field. Activity in this direction, as well as in work for lost children, fallen women, the blind, etc., is ever on the increase; although confessional differences hinder the desired co-operation among those who are of the same faith.

3. The Christian Reformed. — In the third and fourth decades of this century there arose a reaction against the tendency to strip off from Christian faith all the peculiarities of the old confessions. This was supported by such men as DaCosta and Groen van Prinsterer, who never forsook the old church. In 1834 the first departure took place; but it was embarrassed by the law which forbade more than twenty persons to assemble for worship. In 1836 a royal decree, which was renewed in 1841, confirmed the law, but pointed out a way in which new congregations could be formed. The first one thus formed was at Utrecht in 1839. But new decrees in 1849, 1852, and 1868, abrogated all restrictions; and the "Separatist Church" stood before the law like all the others, save that it drew no support from the treasury. In 1869 the synod at Middleburg united this body with certain other scattered congregations of like tendency, who had taken the name of "Churches under the Cross;" and henceforth the whole was known as the "Christian Reformed Church." It adheres in all essential points to the polity of the synod of Dort. Their general synod meets biennially. The ministers are trained at the theological seminary in Kampen, which has seven professors and seventy-nine students (1884). The number of churches rose from two hundred and twenty-six in 1860 to three hundred and seventy-one in 1884. The body has exerted a very happy influence upon the church from which they separated, by developing the power of the old faith, even when deprived of all support from the State.

(c) The Lutheran Church. — The Reformation entered the Netherlands under the form of Lutheranism. But this was soon supplanted, at first by the Baptists, and then by the Reformed; so that, from the middle of the sixteenth century, it has been of subordinate importance. The first congregation was formed at Woerden, and in the year 1566 it adopted the Augsburg Confession; but there was no bond between it and other like assemblies, until in 1603 seven ministers agreed upon a system of faith and worship. This ripened in 1612 into the so-called "Brotherhood," which had a synod which met at first at indefinite intervals, and afterwards every five years. The last one under the republic sat in 1695. In 1818 King William I. gave a new organization to the "Evangelical Lutheran Church," which, however, was modified in 1856 and 1859, so as to render the Church independent of the State. Since 1819 the synod meets yearly, consisting of fifteen members, of whom eight are ministers. The local church is governed by the consistory. During the past century the increase of the body has been slow. In 1784 there were forty-five churches and fifty-seven ministers; in 1815 forty-six churches and sixty ministers; in 1877 fifty churches and nine chapels, with sixty-two ministers. At first, ministers were educated abroad; but in 1816 a seminary was founded at Amsterdam, which now has two professors and six students.

Like all other Protestant bodies, this one felt the influence of rationalism. A re-action against this tendency appeared, in Amsterdam and elsewhere, in 1791, and led ultimately to an open break between the great majority and those who insisted upon maintaining the Augsburg Confession, Liturgy, etc. The latter, being excluded from the "Brotherhood," formed what was called the "Old Lutheran Church," which obtained legal sanction in 1835, and again in 1866. Its concerns are directed by a General Ecclesiastical Assembly, which consists of seventeen persons, of whom nine are clergymen. Candidates for the ministry were formerly educated at different schools in Amsterdam, but, since 1877, in the university, from which one of the Lutheran ministers teaches dogmatics. The Old Lutherans now number eight churches and eleven ministers against four churches and seven ministers of the other.

In course of time the sharp differences between the two bodies gradually became modified; and in 1874 the barriers which hindered the call of a minister of one church to a vacant pulpit in the other were done away. (d) The Baptists. — These are often called "Menonites," from the famous Menno Simons, who died in 1560. They were distinguished from other Protestants, not only by the rejection of infant baptism, but also by the lack of any central organization. Hence the stringent discipline introduced by Menno led to various divisions, known as "Waterlanders" and "Flandrians," from the districts in which they lived; but these were finally adjusted in 1650. Not long afterwards, doctrinal differences produced a new division, in which the orthodox took the name of "Zonists," and the liberals that of "Lamists;" both being derived from the amoral bearings of their respective localities. In 1861 both bodies were re-united, and the old party names passed out of use. The great peculiarity of the church is its confessional freedom. There is no common standard of doctrine. Whoever makes sincere confession of sin, and engages to lead a holy life,
is admitted to membership, without regard to his views of the person and work of Christ. As a rule, only educated persons were from the beginning chosen to the ministry; but, in cases of necessity, men without any theological training were allowed to serve, taking the name of predicators, or exhorters. This custom was gradually abandoned in later years, and now the instances of its occurrence are rare. In 1811 they all united in forming a general society for the encouragement of theological education and the maintenance of the ministry among the poorer congregations. At the same time they enlarged the support and curriculum of the theological seminary which had been established at Amsterdam in 1731 by the Lamists. Their members are found chiefly in Friesland, North Holland, Groningen, and Overijssel. In each province there are assemblies, usually called "rings," or circles. Founders belong to the university of Amsterdam.

Orators of the Reformed Church, in a paper called "The Remonstrants,"—This body dates its existence and its name from the early portion of the seventeenth century, when a number of ministers of the Reformed Church, in a paper called a Remonstrance, demanded a revision of the Belgic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism. After long preparation, a national synod was called to consider the matter, which met in 1618, 1619, and 1620. The supporters, or Remonstrants, or "rings," as they were called, according to the co-operation of the male members, although in some cases the females have a vote. In fewer congregations there are also deaconesses. The seminary contains fifteen students, and its two active professors belong to the university of Amsterdam.

The local church is governed by the minister or ministers with the wardens, the latter being chosen by the male members, although in some cases the females have a vote. In few congregations there are also deaconesses. The seminary contains fifteen students, and its two active professors belong to the university of Amsterdam.

(c) The Remonstrants. — This body dates its existence and its name from the early portion of the seventeenth century, when a number of ministers of the Reformed Church, in a paper called a Remonstrance, demanded a revision of the Belgic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism. After long preparation, a national synod was called to consider the matter, which met in 1618, 1619, and 1620, and was attended by delegates from various foreign churches. This body decided the points at issue by issuing the well-known canons of Dort, maintaining Calvinistic views. All ministers who did not accept these articles were deprived of their office, and, in case they refused to subscribe a promise of obedience to the ecclesiastical authorities, were banished. But after the death of Maurice, Prince of Orange, in 1625, they began gradually to return; and a few years later a decree authorized them to build churches and schools. A system of government and discipline sketched by Uitenbogaard was adopted, and in 1634 a theological seminary was established at Amsterdam. In their church order they stated that they stand fastly adhered to the Holy Scripture, and that they hold fast to their confession (drawn up by Episcopius in 1621) not as a rule of faith, but as an explanation of their views. But in the course of time a great alteration ensued. In 1861 they described themselves as a community in which the gospel of Jesus Christ, according to the Scriptures, was confessed and proclaimed with all freedom and toleration; and in 1878 the revised regulations set forth the aim of the society to be, to further the Christian life on the basis of the gospel, while at the same time holding fast to freedom and toleration. The control of the body is vested in the Great Assembly, which meets yearly, and is composed of the professors, all the ministers, delegates from all the congregations, and some other persons. A permanent committee of five members cares for the execution of the assembly's resolutions, as well as for the supervision of its administration. The body was declining. In 1609 they had thirty-four congregations, with forty preach-
own motion appointed Theodor de Kock in his place. A great number of the clergy rose in opposition, and as many as three hundred priests ranged themselves on the side of Codde. But the new vicar introduced many new priests, and the opposing party began to weaken. At last the chapter chose another archbishop, Cornelius Steenoven, who was consecrated by Varlet, bishop of Babylon in paribus, and thus preserved the succession. Excommunication followed; but the province maintained its position, and to this day has filled each vacancy made by death with a new election. In 1742 a suffragan bishop for Haarlem was appointed, and 1757 one for Deventer. The Old-Catholic, or, as it is popularly called, Jansenist Church, acknowledges the authority of the general councils and of the Tridentine decrees, but rejects the Vatican Council, with the dogmas of the immaculate conception and the papal infallibility.

III. Jews. — All that is certainly known of the condition of these prior to the sixteenth century is that there were found here and there some from Southern Europe who had become Christians to escape persecution, and others from Middle Europe who still held their old faith. But the number largely increased when the close of the eighty-years’ war made the Netherlands a place of refuge for all victims of persecution. They were of two classes,—one called Portuguese, the other German,—whose mutual relations were not very friendly. The former, though fewer in number, were richer and more cultivated; the latter were, for the most part, poor and ignorant, and there was but little intercourse. But this soon changed; since the Germans steadily grew in property and culture, while the others stood still, if they did not retrograde. Some differences in ceremonial, and especially in the pronunciation of the Hebrew, have prevented a complete fusion of the two; although from 1814 to 1870 they were joined in a common organization, and a rabbinical vacancy in one division could be filled by a person called from the other. The increase of the numbers from 52,000 in 1815 to 82,000 in 1882 shows the effect of this reunion.

(a) German Jews. — These incorporated with themselves their brethren already domiciled in the Netherlands, and subsequently the refugees from Poland and Lithuania, and now form the "Netherlandish-Israelite Society." They began to enter the country about the year 1815; although they were neither so much esteemed, nor enjoyed so many privileges, as the Portuguese. The congregation at Maarssen is considered the oldest, but the date of its origin is unknown. The one organized at Amsterdam in 1630 soon became the central point of all the rest. Permission to build a public synagogue was refused in 1648; but after an influx of Polish refugees in 1654, and an immigration of three thousand Lithuanians in 1636, there came finally in 1671 the erection of the still existing Great Synagogue in Amsterdam, in which all parties gradually united to form one congregation. Political equality was not attained until 1796. The first decree respecting the conduct of their affairs was issued in 1808. This established one supreme consistory for the Hollandish-German Israelites. When the country became a French province in 1813, the Jews were made subordinate to the central consistory in Paris; but the next year King William I. appointed a "General Commission of Advice" for all the Jews in the kingdom. From 1862 a strenuous endeavor was made to attain a definite organization, which, however, did not succeed until 1870; since which time the direction of the Netherlandish-Israelite Society, which is no longer united with the Portuguese, is in the hands of a central board, which meets yearly, while a permanent committee of three, sitting in Amsterdam, attends to the current business of the society. The whole body consists of a hundred and seventy-three congregations, which are divided into various circles and branches. Each local society is autonomous; and its spiritual interests are controlled by rabbis, instructors, and teachers. These are trained in a seminary which was founded for this purpose at Amsterdam in 1741, and was reorganized in 1802.

(b) Portuguese. — In 1492 the Jews were banished from Spain, after they had become wealthy and refined. Many fled to Portugal, where they were again persecuted, especially after the introduction of the Inquisition, in 1532. When Brielle fell into the hands of the Prince of Orange (1572), many of the refugees from Portugal were attracted toward North Netherlands, and, becoming esteemed for their activity and success in trade, found little difficulty in settling there. They increased in number in Amsterdam until 1597, when they secured their first synagogue, which was soon followed by many others. In The Hague, also, there was early formed a synagogue of rich and influential Israelites. In 1638 they established at Amsterdam a school, from which proceeded the rabbinical seminary of to-day. Since 1870 affairs are managed by a central board. The society at The Hague has one rabbin, while that at Amsterdam has a college of three associates.

J. A. GERTH VAN WIJK, T. W. CHAMBERS.

HOLLAZ, David, a Lutheran theologian; b. at Wulkow, Pomerania, 1648; studied at Erfurt and Wittenberg; successively pastor in Pötzelin, Stargard, Colberg, and Jakobsberg; died 1713. He is specially known by his work on systematic theology, Examen theologicum acrasmaticum universam theologiam theticopolsemicam completens, 1707 (7th ed. by Teller, 1750). The great popularity of this work was not due to its originality of thought, but to the clearness and terseness of its definitions, and especially to the genial and ironic tone and the living scriptural character of its theology. He is the last of the strict Lutheran theologians, but in that period of transition took an intermediate position between Lutheran orthodoxy and Pietism; the latter, though it is not mentioned by name, exerting a subtle influence upon his views. In his explanation of the so-called "theology of the unregenerate" he shows its influence; in the distinction between fundamentals and non-fundamentals, that of Calvin.

WAGENMANN.

HOLMES, Robert, D.D., b. in Hampshire, 1749; d. at Oxford, 1805. He was educated at Oxford, took holy orders; became Dean of Winchester 1804. His great service to biblical literature was Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum Varia Lectionibus, Oxford, 1798-27, 5 vols., edited after his
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According to John (xix. 41) there was a garden close by the spot where our Lord was crucified; and in the garden was a new sepulchre, in which he was laid, because it was nigh at hand, and it was the Jews' preparation-day. Otherwise the locality of the tomb is not indicated in the Gospels; nor is Golgotha, the spot where the crucifixion took place, located with any more definiteness. From Matt. xxvii. 32, John xix. 17, and Mark xv. 29, and more especially from Heb. xiii. 12, it is apparent that it lay outside the city; and from Matt. xxvii. 39, and Mark xv. 22, it may be inferred that a public road ran by it: indeed, the Romans used to select such localities for places of execution in order to make the punishment more impressive to the people. But this is all. The name gives no certain clue. The Hebrew Golgotha has by some—Jerome in old times, Krafft and Hengstenberg in modern times—been translated the "Hill of Death," the name denoting a public place of execution; but both linguistic and archaeological reasons speak against this derivation. The evangelists translate the "place of a skull" or simply the "skull" (Luke xxiii. 33), probably referring to some topographical feature—a rock protruding through the soil in the form of a skull, or bare as a skull. Whether Golgotha was a slight elevation, or a hill, or a mountain, they leave undecided, and so does Eusebius. The pilgrim of Bezaeus, however, and Rosenmuller, speaking of Monticella Golgota, or Golgotha Rupe, where the Mount Calvary of so frequent occurrence in the Roman-Catholic Church; that is, a hill with a chapel on its top, to which leads a pilgrim's path, with stations indicative of the various events of the passion.

In direct contradiction, as it would seem, to the above passages (Matt. xxvii. 32; John xix. 17; Mark xv. 20; and Heb. xiii. 12), the places which tradition points out for the crucifixion and sepulchre of our Lord lie a good distance within the wall of the present city. From the tower of David, at the Jaffa gate, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre is descried, situated to the north-north-east, and rising on a hill between two minarets. But as early as in the eighth century, and again in the eighteenth century the tradition was formally rejected by Korte, Reise nach dem gelobten Lande, Altona, 1741, with three supplements, Halle, 1746. He was followed by Clarke (Travels in Palestine, London, 1811), Robinson (Biblical Researches, Boston, 1841, and Topography of Jerusalem, in Bibliotheca Sacra, 1846), Töbler (Golgotha, St. Gall, 1851), Wilson (The Lands of the Bible, London, 1847), and Schaff (Through Bible Lands, New York, 1879). The tradition has been defended by Chateaubriand (Itinéraire de Paris à Jerusalem, Paris, 1811), Scholz (Comm. de Golgotha siu, Bonn, 1825), Williams (The Holy City, London, 1845; 2d ed., 1849), Schultz (Jerusalem, Bonn, 1846), Lord Nugent (Lands Classical and Sacred, London, 1845), Tischendorf (Reise in den Orient, Leipzig, 1846), George Finlay (On the Site of the Holy Sepulchre, London, 1847), Schaffler (Die echte Lage des heiligen Grabes, Bonn, 1846), De Vogué (Les Églises et les Tombeaux de Saint-Souvenirs, Paris, 1860), Seppl (Jerusalem, 2d ed., 1873), Clermont-Ganneau (L'Authentique du Saint-Sepulcre, Paris, 1877).

It would not be altogether impossible, however, to reconcile the Gospels and the tradition, as the site of the city-wall was so considerably altered by Hadrian that many places formerly outside of it came to lie inside of it, and vice versa. But new difficulties arise from the circumstance that at the tradition gives no perfect certainty with respect to the identity of the localities it points out. Of course the first Christians knew 24 places where Christ was crucified and buried; and they evidently did not give much attention, or ascribe much value, to such externalities. Thus, when the Jewish war broke out, towards the close of 67, the Christians left Jerusalem for Pella; and when they, later on, returned, the captors and destruction of the city must have wrought such changes as to make the identification of special localities of no strongly marked external distinction very difficult. Then, again, we have no certain clue to the place of Golgotha. Hadrian rebuilt the city on an entirely new plan,
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and with the avowed purpose of obliterating the distinctive character of the old city, new changes took place, which have made the tradition less and less reliable. It has been argued that the unbroken list of bishops of Jerusalem which Eusebius gives from James, the brother of the Lord, to Macarius, is a guaranty of the continuity of the tradition living in the congregation; but here again, while the list is not based on documents: he had it from hearsay. It has also been argued that the frequent pilgrimages to the holy places of Jerusalem, which, according to Cyril (Catech., 17, 10), were made from the time of the apostles, testify in favor of the tradition; but the earliest visitors to Jerusalem — Alexander of Flavius, in Cappadocia, and Origen — do not give the impression that at their time the holy places were specially contented itself in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit with the article, “I believe in the Holy Ghost;” but the Creed of Constantinople (381) contains the fuller statement, “And [we believe] in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of life, who spake by the holy prophets.” As of the Father and the Son, so of the Spirit, we cannot think of a time when he was not active. He appears as the executive of God at all times, but is brought forward prominently in the New Dispensation as the efficient agent in the renewal of the soul and its advancement in holiness. In the Old Testament he seems to have been active from the moment of creation, when the “Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters” (Gen. i. 2), and God said that his “Spirit should not always strive with man” (Gen. vi. 3). He is said to have fallen upon God’s agents (1 Sam. x. 10). He was the author of the light which the Old-Testament prophets had of Christ (1 Pet. i. 11), and of their inspiration (2 Pet. i. 21). In many of the cases in the Old Testament, it is doubtful whether a distinct person is meant by the designation “Spirit” or merely the power of God. But in the New Testament the uncertainty vanishes; and not only is his distinct personality made prominent, but a definite work assigned to him. He had a part in the life of Christ, was active in his generation (Luke i. 35), descended upon him at the baptism (Matt. iii. 16), and led him into the desert of temptation (Matt. iv. 1).

In his last discourses our Lord referred repeatedly to him, and made the promise that he should come upon the disciples (John xvi. 7; Acts i. 8, etc.). In these passages the Holy Spirit is declared to be the representative of Christ after his removal from the earth, and the dispenser of the benefits of Christ’s life to the souls of believers. He was the “other Comforter” (Paraclete), who should take the place of Christ in leading the disciples into the way of all truth (John xiv. 16, xv. 27, xvii. 13). He is the permanent companion and guide of the Church, in contrast to the earthly Christ, who dwelt only temporarily on the earth (John xiv. 16). The Spirit is called the Spirit of Christ (Rom. viii. 9), because he holds the relation of a dispenser to the benefits of Christ’s salvation. Descended upon the Son of God, he is similar to that which the Son has to the Father. As the Son reveals the Father to the world (John
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i. 18), so the Spirit reveals the grace and meritorious atonement and promises of Christ to the heart of the believer (John xvi. 15).

This special work in the history of redemption was inaugurated ten days after the Lord's ascension, on the Day of Pentecost, when the disciples were endued with power, and spoke in unknown tongues. As the historic birth-night of Christ was celebrated by attendant supernatural phenomena, such as the anthems of the angels, and the heavenly glory, so the historical birthday of the Holy Spirit in the Church was accompanied by strange external manifestations—tongues like as of fire, and a sound from heaven as of the rushing of a mighty wind (Acts ii. 2, 3). Since that time he has been active in the Church, the source of all spiritual enlightenment, and without whose agency man neither knows Christ as his Saviour, nor can call him Lord (1 Cor. xii. 3). He is the originator of convictions of sin, that is, of the sinfulness of refusing to believe in Christ (John xvi. 9), and the author of regeneration (John iii. 5). He promotes the sanctification of the soul (1 Cor. vii. 11), and imparts to the Church his special gifts (1 Cor. xii. 4). The agency of the Spirit is, however, not completed with this activity, but extends to assuring the believer of his union with Christ, and participation in the promises of eternal life (Rom. viii. 3). All spiritual blessings, righteousness, peace, and joy, come to the believer by reason of his reception of the Holy Spirit (Rom. xiv. 17; Eph. ii. 18). For this reason the unbeliever is warned against rejecting the knowledge and convictions of the Spirit, which is called "grieving" (Eph. iv. 30), "quenching" (1 Thess. v. 19), and "doing despite unto" the Spirit (Heb. x. 29). All kinds and degrees of sin may be forgiven, except the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (Matt. xii. 31, 32). This sin is absolutely unpardonable, because it is the final rejection of him without whom a saving knowledge of Christ and regeneration are impossible.

This dispensation has been called the dispensation of the Spirit. The designation is true so far as it brings out the prominency of the Spirit's agency and influence. But the Spirit's work is in no sense an atoning work, or the sacrifice of a new life and a spiritual energy, and continues to be so. The early apostles and Christians were full "of faith and the Holy Ghost" (Acts iv. 8, vi. 5), and in the power of this endowment spoke in council-halls, wrote epistles, and suffered violent deaths, in hope and amidst rejoicing. There is nothing in the New Testament to indicate that this manifestation of power was to be confined to apostolic times, although it is not unreasonable to suppose that the methods of his manifestation may be different in kind at different epochs.


HOMER.


HOLY WATER, the use of, i.e., water blessed by a priest or bishop for religious purposes, is an old Oriental, more especially Jewish, custom, which was adopted by the Christian Church, and is still retained in the Greek and Roman Church. In the Greek Church pure water is used; in the Roman, a little salt is added, which by the Greek is considered a scandalous and dangerous novelty. In both churches the practice has given rise to much superstition.

HOLY WEEK (Hedomas Magna, or Sancta, or Nigra), the last week of Lent, commencing at midnight on Palm Sunday, and ending at cockcrow on Easter Day, including, besides Palm Sunday and Holy Saturday, Maundy Thursday, the anniversary of the institution of the Lord's Supper, and Good Friday, the anniversary of the Crucifixion. The earliest mention of the celebration of Holy Week, as generally prevailing throughout the Church, occurs in the Apostolical constitutions, and in the writings of Dionysius of Alexandria, from the middle of the third century. The whole week was kept as a strict fast; that is, the diet was restricted to bread, salt, vegetables, and water, and total abstinence was practised on Friday and Saturday, or at least on the last day. At the time of Theodosius, all private and public business was suspended, even the courts were closed. Prisoners for debt or minor misdemeanors were released, slaves were manumitted, etc. All work was, so far as possible, laid aside; and special opportunities of instruction in the elements of faith were offered. The history of the Passion was recited on successive days, beginning with the narrative of St. Matthew, on Palm Sunday, and ending with that of St. John, on Good Friday. In the Roman-Catholic Church, Holy Week is still celebrated by rigorous penitence (fast and almsgiving), by suspension of work in the family, by increased solemnity of the services (no instrumental music, veiling of the statues and pictures, etc.), and by special services (the consecration of the chrism, the blessing of the fire by which the paschal light is lighted, etc.). Several Protestant churches, such as the Church of England and the Lutheran churches in Scantia, also commemorate Holy Week. See Wiseman: Lectures on the Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church, London, 1836, 2 vols.

HOLZHAUSER. See Bartholomites.

HOMER, William Bradford, b. in Boston, Jan. 31, 1817; d. at South Berwick, Me., March 7, 1841. His father was a merchant, distinguished for Christian philanthropy. His mother was a lineal descendant of William Bradford, a passenger in "The Mayflower," and the second governor of Plymouth Colony. At the age of five years,
young Homer began to attend school; and, from that time until six months before his death, he was a constant attendant at schools of different gradations. In 1827 he became a member of the Mount Pleasant Classical Institution at Amherst, Mass. Here he remained three years. Under the instruction of Mr. Gregory Perdicari he acquired such familiarity with the modern Greek that he was able to speak as well as read it with facility. He passed the year 1831-32 as a member of Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass. He was the youngest member of his class, but was selected to deliver the valedictory addresses at his graduation. He was also, perhaps, the youngest member of his class at Amherst College; and, although his class was noted for scholarship and general excellence, yet at his graduation in 1836 he received the valedictory honors. At the age of nineteen he entered the Theological Seminary and was noted for the purity of his character and the development of a definite theme; as, for example, Augustine's discourse on the "Love of the World" (De amore Dei et amore seculi). The homily pursued the analytical method, and expounded a paragraph or verse of Scripture; as, for example, Augustine's discourses with the heading Des co quod scripturam est. Abiding by this radical idea of the homily, we shall be forced to define homiletics as the science of preaching to believers. In this narrower sense the subject has been treated by Schleiermacher, Schweizer, Palmet, Harnack, Oosterzee, and others. For this reason some have treated evangelistics, or missionary preaching, as a separate department; while others, in order to avoid the separate discussion, have discarded the term "homiletics" altogether, and substituted in its stead, as more comprehensive, "keryktics" (from κηρύκω, "to preach," Acts viii. 5), or "halieutics" (from ἱλιαυτός, "to fish," John xxi. 8). Both of these designations are Seminarian stylists, and were taken into consideration mainly those unacquainted with the gospel.

The scope of the science of homiletics is found in the New-Testament idea of bearing witness for Christ (ὑπό τούτου, Matt. xxiv. 14; Acts i. 8, 22; etc.). This expression includes both classes as the subjects of preaching,—believers and non-believers. Homiletics is, therefore, to be regarded as having a scope larger than the strict etymology and historical use of the term "homily" would warrant. It is the scientific treatment of preaching considered as a witnessing for Christ in public worship. This definition does not include missionary preaching; that is, preaching to those who have never heard the gospel. The use of the term "homiletics" dates from the latter half of the seventeenth century (Bailer. Comp. Theol. Homil., 1677; Krumholz: Comp. Homil., 1890).

II. Homiletics and Rhetoric.—The first Christian preachers did not trouble themselves about the rules of classical rhetoric, and cared little for the "enticing words of man's wisdom" (1 Cor. ii. 4, 5). But, as preaching became more studied and elaborate, the pulpit could not ignore the rules of Greek and Roman eloquence. The time came when the most prominent pulpit orators—like Basil, the two Gregories, Chrysostom, and Augustine—were those who had themselves been teachers of rhetoric. The result has been, that from that time to this, a greater or less extent, sacred oratory has been regarded as a branch or species of general rhetoric. Erasmus, Melanchthon, Herder, Theremin, Vincent, are among those who represent this view. Others, however, like the Pietists of the eighteenth century (Spener, etc.) and Stier in this, demand the use that divorce of the pulpit from the rules of rhetoric, opposing all union with "the strange woman that speaks smooth words," and all accommodation to aesthetic prejudices. No such divorce can be admitted; and yet the higher sphere to which the pulpit belongs, and the nature of the topics discussed, make it necessary for homiletics to treat of the preparation and delivery of the sermon as subjects peculiar to itself. There is much that sacred and forensic eloquence have in common. A mind charged with the subject, dialectic training, lucid arrangement, fine language, keen psychological perception, lively imagination, such qualities as these all constitute the spring.
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from which both kinds of eloquence alike flow, as is proved from the lives of sacred orators from Basil and Chrysostom down to Krummacher and Spurgeon. Likewise, in the structure of the discourse, the same logical and aesthetic rules of grouping, the use of oratorical figures, etc., apply to both. But the features in which they differ are more numerous than those in which they agree. Sacred eloquence is distinguished by its subject-matter, its definite moral and religious purpose, and the means proper to be used to secure conviction. Forensic rhetoric seeks to secure objects confined to this life, whether personal or disinterested. The aim of preaching reaches out beyond the confines of this world, and concerns the soul’s eternal blessedness and God’s glory.

Again: the sacred orator may never resort to artificial devices; nor may he place reliance, in his efforts to convince the soul, upon his manner, or diction, or argumentation. He must depend upon the vitalizing power of the truth (Isa. lv. 11; John vi. 63; Heb. iv. 12, etc.) and the direct influence of the Holy Spirit; for, as Luther says, “the speaker convinces no man to believe a thing: it is the word of God itself that must lead him to accept the truth to be the word of God” (Op., xiii.). Rhetoric has, therefore, no place in preaching as an end in itself. It may only be used as a means for the effective presentation of the gospel which is laid upon the preacher. And all artistic structure of the sermon is to be discarded which prejudices the simplicity and power of the Word. In this connection it is well to remember that preachers, as they grow in experience of the truth, discard the rhetorical arts which they practised when they began to preach, and use a more direct and plain mode of utterance.

III. DESIGN OF PREACHING. — The most important designations in the New Testament for preaching determine its character as the joyous proclamation of salvation through Christ. In κηρυσσεως (“to preach,” Matt. iv. 23, etc.) the emphasis is upon the novelty of the message; in ευαγγελιζεσθαι (“to preach the gospel,” Matt. xi. 5, etc.), upon its joyous content; and in διδασκειν (“to teach,” Matt. xi. 1, etc.), the reference is to its lucid explanation. All these elements are combined in μαρτυρειν (“to bear witness,” Acts i. 8, etc.), where the emphasis is upon the vouching for the truth on the ground of personal experience. The object of preaching, then, is none other than to direct the world to the way of blessedness, to call the unconverted to repentance, and to confirm believers in their faith. To secure this result, the most essential thing is the energizing power of the word of God itself. The next, and not less important, factor is the power of a personal witness filled with the Holy Ghost. The matter of preaching everywhere and at all times must be salvation through Christ. But, while this is true, the distinction must not be overlooked between the preaching addressed to believing congregations on the one hand, and apostolic and missionary preaching on the other.

IV. HISTORY OF HOMILETICS. 1. The Fathers. — A few scattered directions for preaching are given by Origen, Cyprian, Lactantius, and Aquinas. Chrysostom and Augustine were the first to go elaborately into the subject. Both drew upon their own personal experiences as rhetoricians and preachers. In his work the Priesthood (De Sacerdotio, books iv., v.), Chrysostom defines as some of the personal qualifications of the preacher, eloquence, dialectic skill in the use of Scripture, readiness in the defence of the faith, diligence in preparation, and regard for the praise of God rather than man. For similar rules, see also Basil (Sermons Aucte de Fide) and Gregory of Nazianzus (Carmen de Episopio). Augustine, in his Christian Truth (De Doct. Christ., iv.), which might almost be called a treatise on homiletics, makes a sharp distinction between the preacher that proclaims salvation through Christ and the very form of his utterance, from the Scriptures. He urges Cicero’s threefold purpose of public speech,—to instruct (docere), to persuade (falectare), and to please (delectare).
however, special emphasis upon the last. He also urges the necessity of an accord between the preacher’s life and words, of prayer as a preparation for the sermon, etc.

2. The Middle Ages magnified liturgical forms and ordinances as constituent parts of worship, to the prejudice of the sermon, which in time was almost entirely neglected. In the first half of this period there are three writers on the genus; the most notable of these is Guibert of Nogent (d. 1124; Liber Institutionis) directs attention again to Augustine’s rules. Guibert of Nogent (d. 1124; Liber quo ordine sermo fieri debet) insists that no more should be put into a sermon than can be carried away in the memory; that the pulpit should practise the textual rather than the allegorical method of interpretation, and seek to lift men up to better lives, rather than indulge in the refinements of theological discussion. The third, Alauus of Ryssel (twelfth century), wrote a work entitled Summa de Arte Prædicatoria. In the second half of this period we meet first with Bouvaventure’s work Ars Concionandi. He was followed by Humbert de Romanis (d. 1277; Tract. de Eruditi. Concionatorum). But the period furnishes nothing of importance till near its close, when Reuchlin (Liber Congestorum de Arte Prædicatoris, 1504) seeks to revive pulpit oratory, which had fallen into almost total neglect, by insisting upon the presentation of proper and practical subjects, and the rules of rhetoric.

3. The Period since the Reformation. — During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries homiletics was built up into a science, but placed in the closest relations to the rhetoric of antiquity. The revival of preaching by the Reformers led to the prejudice of the sermon, which in time was almost entirely neglected. In the first half of this period there are three writers on the genus; the most notable of these is Guibert of Nogent (d. 1124; Liber quo ordine sermo fieri debet) insists that no more should be put into a sermon than can be carried away in the memory; that the pulpit should practise the textual rather than the allegorical method of interpretation, and seek to lift men up to better lives, rather than indulge in the refinements of theological discussion. The third, Alauus of Ryssel (twelfth century), wrote a work entitled Summa de Arte Prædicatoria. In the second half of this period we meet first with Bouvaventure’s work Ars Concionandi. He was followed by Humbert de Romanis (d. 1277; Tract. de Eruditi. Concionatorum). But the period furnishes nothing of importance till near its close, when Reuchlin (Liber Congestorum de Arte Prædicatoris, 1504) seeks to revive pulpit oratory, which had fallen into almost total neglect, by insisting upon the presentation of proper and practical subjects, and the rules of rhetoric.

3. The Period since the Reformation. — During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries homiletics was built up into a science, but placed in the closest relations to the rhetoric of antiquity. The revival of preaching by the Reformers led to the prejudice of the sermon, which in time was almost entirely neglected. In the first half of this period there are three writers on the genus; the most notable of these is Guibert of Nogent (d. 1124; Liber quo ordine sermo fieri debet) insists that no more should be put into a sermon than can be carried away in the memory; that the pulpit should practise the textual rather than the allegorical method of interpretation, and seek to lift men up to better lives, rather than indulge in the refinements of theological discussion. The third, Alauus of Ryssel (twelfth century), wrote a work entitled Summa de Arte Prædicatoria. In the second half of this period we meet first with Bouvaventure’s work Ars Concionandi. He was followed by Humbert de Romanis (d. 1277; Tract. de Eruditi. Concionatorum). But the period furnishes nothing of importance till near its close, when Reuchlin (Liber Congestorum de Arte Prædicatoris, 1504) seeks to revive pulpit oratory, which had fallen into almost total neglect, by insisting upon the presentation of proper and practical subjects, and the rules of rhetoric.

3. The Period since the Reformation. — During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries homiletics was built up into a science, but placed in the closest relations to the rhetoric of antiquity. The revival of preaching by the Reformers led to the prejudice of the sermon, which in time was almost entirely neglected. In the first half of this period there are three writers on the genus; the most notable of these is Guibert of Nogent (d. 1124; Liber quo ordine sermo fieri debet) insists that no more should be put into a sermon than can be carried away in the memory; that the pulpit should practise the textual rather than the allegorical method of interpretation, and seek to lift men up to better lives, rather than indulge in the refinements of theological discussion. The third, Alauus of Ryssel (twelfth century), wrote a work entitled Summa de Arte Prædicatoria. In the second half of this period we meet first with Bouvaventure’s work Ars Concionandi. He was followed by Humbert de Romanis (d. 1277; Tract. de Eruditi. Concionatorum). But the period furnishes nothing of importance till near its close, when Reuchlin (Liber Congestorum de Arte Prædicatoris, 1504) seeks to revive pulpit oratory, which had fallen into almost total neglect, by insisting upon the presentation of proper and practical subjects, and the rules of rhetoric.

3. The Period since the Reformation. — During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries homiletics was built up into a science, but placed in the closest relations to the rhetoric of antiquity. The revival of preaching by the Reformers led to the prejudice of the sermon, which in time was almost entirely neglected. In the first half of this period there are three writers on the genus; the most notable of these is Guibert of Nogent (d. 1124; Liber quo ordine sermo fieri debet) insists that no more should be put into a sermon than can be carried away in the memory; that the pulpit should practise the textual rather than the allegorical method of interpretation, and seek to lift men up to better lives, rather than indulge in the refinements of theological discussion. The third, Alauus of Ryssel (twelfth century), wrote a work entitled Summa de Arte Prædicatoria. In the second half of this period we meet first with Bouvaventure’s work Ars Concionandi. He was followed by Humbert de Romanis (d. 1277; Tract. de Eruditi. Concionatorum). But the period furnishes nothing of importance till near its close, when Reuchlin (Liber Congestorum de Arte Prædicatoris, 1504) seeks to revive pulpit oratory, which had fallen into almost total neglect, by insisting upon the presentation of proper and practical subjects, and the rules of rhetoric.
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in this world; and Mare兹zell (Bestimmung d. Konzilredners, 1798) lays down the proposition that the pulpit should discourse not what Christ taught, but what he would teach if he were now on earth. The protests of believing theologians like Bengel and Oetinger against this intellectual assumption found only a small audience. At the close of the century the Kantian philosophy, which treats of the analysis, classification, preparation, composition, and delivery of sermons, viewed as addressed to the popular mind, on subjects suggested by the word of God, and designed for the conversion of sinners and the edification of believers, became known as "sacred rhetoric;" and it bears to rhetoric in general the same relation which rhetoric itself, according to Whateley, bears to logic. One must approach it, therefore, through both of these other sciences, and carry with him all which they have taught him; so that he may apply it all, and utilize it all, in the particular work of preaching. It gives directions for the choice of subjects, and the relation of these to texts of Scripture, as the passages by which they are suggested, or in which they are implied. It analyzes the sermon founded on such a text into its different parts,—of introduction, proposition, argument, division, and application or conclusion,—and lays down rules regarding each of these, so that they may be natural, simple, proportionate, and effective. In particular it insists that the discourse should be a unit, aiming at one result, and rising by climactic stages toward its attainment. It classifies sermons under different heads, as expository, hortatory, doctrinal, practical, and occasional; though it ought not to be forgotten that the ideal discourse should be all of these in one, as founded on biblical exposition, illustrative of scriptural doctrine, and devoted to the enforcement of some practical duty, which needs at the time to be insisted upon. It has much to say also on the formation of a pulpit style which should be characterized by clearness, purity, precision, and energy; and it gives important counsels as to the choice of arguments and the use of illustrations. It has to do, besides, with the delivery of sermons, and brings the rules of elocution to bear upon the work of the pulpit, so that the words of the preacher may not be marred, but rather made more effective, by the manner of their utterance. In all these departments it seeks to illustrate the value of its rules from the history of preaching in ancient, medieval, and modern times, and to discuss the questions regarding them on which different views have been maintained. Thus, for example, in almost every treatise on homiletics, one expects to find an examination of such inquiries as these,—whether the division of a subject should be announced beforehand; whether the proposition mainly enforced should be formulated at the beginning, or at the end, of the discourse; whether a sermon should be read from manuscript, or delivered memoriter, or preached extemporaneously, etc. On these and hundred questions, the opinions maintained depend on the predilections or practices of the authors; and the fact that such differences exist may be taken as a proof that a definite course regarding them is not essential to homiletic efficiency; and every preacher may be left to do regarding them that which he has found he can do most successively.

As a science, there can be no doubt whatever of its helpfulness to those who are engaged in the work of the ministry; but, unless two or three
cautions are observed, it is exceedingly apt to become a hindrance, rather than an assistance.

1. It should be so thoroughly mastered before entering upon the practical work of the pulpit, that its rules shall be unconsciously observed. Whatever takes the attention of the preacher away from the main purpose of his sermon to some technical detail does thereby inevitably mar the sermon itself. Hence all such things as style and structure must be acquired so thoroughly, that no attention is abstracted by them from the thought. In like manner, every thing that in the pulpit draws the mind of the preacher away from that which he is saying, and the object which he has in view in saying it, to the manner in which he says it, takes just so much away from the force of his utterance. It does not follow, however, that no attention should be given to the latter. On the contrary, the correct inference is, that he should have so mastered them, that he can use them without thinking of them, just as one has so mastered spelling, that he is not conscious of any such act when he is writing. The moment one hesitates to give the names of things, he becomes conscious that he has to spell, he is very apt to make a mistake; and that simple illustration may help to show the importance of the caution which we are now giving. Rules are valuable; but their highest value is when we have ceased to be conscious that they are rules, and act upon them spontaneously. To do that, however, we must give early attention to them, and master them fully, before we need to practise them in public.

The place of homiletics in learning to preach is thus analogous to that of spelling in learning to write. It should come at the very beginning, and it should be mastered so completely, that we act upon its maxims without thinking of them.

2. The preacher must never let himself be tempted to make the sermon an end in itself. It must be confessed, that, after one has studied the rules of homiletics, he is strongly tempted to think that his work is to consist in making good sermons that shall stand the test of the strictest homiletic scrutiny. But the object of the preacher is to convert sinners, to edify believers, and in general to help his fellow-men to live lives of faith and joy in Christ. The sermon ought to be designed for that. By all means let it be according to rule; but let the observance of the rules be made subservient, and kept subservient, to the main purpose. The surgeon seeks to save the patient; and, if he put the brilliancy of the operation above that, he is no true surgeon. In like manner, the preacher should keep in view the great design ought to be to help men unto Christ and up to Christ; and, if he degenerate into the sermon-maker or the pulpiteer, he has lost the true ideal of his office. Whenever the producing of great sermons becomes an aim in and of itself, the production may be what many people will congratulate the preacher for making; — a splendid effort; but it is not a sermon in the right use of the word, inasmuch as that seeks something else than the admiration of the hearers, even their salvation and edification. Every student of homiletics, therefore, must be on his guard against allowing himself to think of the sermon as an end in itself.

3. The observance of rules will not of itself make an effective sermon. One man may keep every regulation laid down regarding the preparation and delivery of a discourse, and yet be only "faultily faultless, ściły regular, splendidly null." Another may break many of the rules, and yet be most successful in converting, strengthening, and stimulating his hearers. The man is greater than the sermon; and the touch of his individuality thrills his hearers, though his division should be faulty, and his style uncouth. Even the heathen orator said that one must be a good man to be really eloquent; and so the personality of the preacher has more to do with his efficiency in the pulpit than the perfection of his sermon. He must be seen to be sincere. He must have "the accent of conviction." He must be earnest, — not with the earnestness of rant or roaring, but with that of fervid incandescence. He must know the hearts of other men through his acquaintance with his own. He must be familiar with their "businesses," as well as with their "bosoms," and preach to them, not because the Sabbath comes round, and he must say something to them, but because he has something which he must say to them at that particular time, and which mightily concerns their welfare. It is this "I cannot but' speak in the preacher himself which is the secret, next to the agency of the Holy Ghost, of pulpit-power; and no homiletic rules, however faithfully observed, will compensate for its absence. But if that be in him, and he has mastered the rules of this science so that he can obey them automatically, he will be the ideal preacher, and men will gladly listen to his words.

Lit. — In recent years there has been increased attention given to homiletics, owing to the formation of such lectureships as the "Lyman Beecher" course at Yale; and many valuable works have appeared upon the subject. In addition to those named by Dr. Christlieb, the following works are all of value, and deserve mention. William G. Blaikie: For the Work of the Ministry, London, 1873; William S. Plumer: Hints and Helps in Pastoral Theology, New York, 1874; Patrick Fairbairn: Pastoral Theology, Edinburgh, 1875; William Arthur: The Tongue of Fire, New York, 1880; John A. Broadus: The Preparation and Delivery of Sermons, last edition, Philadelphia, 1880, Lectures on the History of Preaching, New York, 1878; E. Paxton Hood: Lamps, Pitchers, and Trumpets, new edition, New York, 1872; Robert T. Daniel: Sacred Rhetoric, New York, 1870; Stephen H. Ting, Sen.: The Office and Duties of a Christian Pastor, New York, 1874; Samuel McAll: Delivery, Lecture-Room Hints, London, 1875; Storr: Conditions of Success in Preaching without Notes, New York, 1875; Charles J. Brown: Preaching, its Properties, Place, and Power, 1870; John C. Miller: Letters to a Pastor, New York, 1878; Bishop Bedell: The Pastor, Philadelphia, 1880; Bishop Ellicott: Homiletical and Pastoral Lectures, 1880; J. J. van Oosterzee: Practical Theology, New York, 1880; Austin Phelps: Theory of Preaching, 1861; Fiske: Manual of Preaching, 1884. For all the appendices in the works of Blaikie and Kidder. Attention should be given to The Preacher's
Homiliarium denoted, from the beginning of the middle ages, collections of homilies and sermons for reading in the church on Sundays and holidays, or introduced by official authority among the clergy as models of the art of preaching. Such collections existed before the time of Charlemagne, both in the Gallican and in the Anglo-Saxon Church; but the most celebrated and the most widely used collection of the kind was the homiliarium of Charlemagne. The unsuitability of many of the selections from the fathers, and, still more, the frequent mistakes and corruptions which occurred in the common collection, caused Charlemagne to charge Paulinus Diaconus with the collection of a new homiliarium, under the superintendence of Alcuin. Between 776 and 784 the work was finished. Manuscript copies of it are found in the libraries of Heidelberg, Darmstadt, Frankfort, Giessen, Cassel, Fulda, etc. The first printed edition, without title, date, or place, was probably made at Cologne, 1470. A comparison between the various editions shows that the contents of the book increased with the increasing number of festivals and saints' days. New sermons by later teachers — Alcuin, Haimo, Andbertus, Hericus, Bernard, and others — were added. The bulk, however, of the contents, as well as the original plan of the arrangement, was retained. On the development of the art of preaching, and on the final establishment of the system of pericopes, this collection has exercised a great influence; and it was, no doubt, instrumental in carrying the Roman system of pericopes into the evangelical churches. The Book of Homilies of the Church of England is the nearest approach in the Protestant Church to the homiliarium.

Homily. See Homiletics.

Homologoumena (generally accepted) and Antilegomena (disputed) are the two terms which Eusebius applies to the authorship of the books of the New Testament, placing the four Gospels, the Acts, the fourteen Epistles of Paul, the first Epistle of Peter, and the first Epistle of John, under the former, and the Epistle of James, the second Epistle of Peter, the second and third Epistles of John, and the Epistle of Jude, under the latter. The Apocalypse he gives a place by itself, though, according to his own definition, it belonged to the Antilegomena. See Canon of the New Testament.

Homousian (of similar substance) and homoousian (of the same substance) are the two terms on which the whole Arian controversy turned; the former representing the semi-Arian view; the latter, the orthodox. The term of Arian was heteroousian ("of different substance"). See Arianism.

Honey. See Bee-Culture among the Hebrews.

Honorius, Roman emperor from 383 to 423; was only ten years old, when, under the tutelage of Stilicho, he succeeded his father, Theodosius I, in the Western Empire, while his brother Arcadius inherited the Eastern. Honorius was a weak character. He made the laws of Theodosius against Paganism still harder. In 399 he ordered all Pagan temples to be destroyed at once; but he was unable to enforce such a law. In North Africa, where, in many places, the Pagans outnumbered the Christians, the Christians were made to suffer for the laws against Paganism. In 408 the emperor suddenly changed his mind, and a decree placed the Pagans on an equal footing with the Christians, but again excluded them from all offices in the army and in the administration. Somewhat more consistent he showed himself in his relations with the Donatists, whom he pursued with steadily increasing severity. But he never succeeded in suppressing the heresy; he only drove the heretics into the wildest fanaticism. See Donatists.

Honorius is the name of four popes and an antipope. — Honorius I. (618–689) sided, in the monotheletic controversy, with the emperor and the patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria, that is, with the Monothelites, and set forth his views in two letters, still extant, to the Patriarch of Constantinople. In consequence he was anathematized by the sixth ecumenical council (Constantinople, 680), together with the other leaders of the Monothelites; and the verdict, which was given with the assent of the papallegates, was confirmed by his successor, Leo II. This grim fact, that the papal infallibility has once been in the possession of a heretic, was in the middle ages generally passed over in silence by Roman writers; and when, afterwards, Rome was reminded of it by the Greek Church, the most audacious shifts were attempted to deny it, or to cover it out of sight. Baronius and Gretser declared that the acts of the council were false; Bellarmine and Assemani, that the verdict was a mistake by the council; Garnier and Pagi, that the condemnation touched only the policy of the Pope, not the doctrine. When, in 1570, the papal infallibility was established in the Church, the literature on the question swelled into a library. See Hefele: Causa Honorii Papa, Naples, 1870; Margerie: Le pape Honor., Paris, 1870; J. Pennachi: De Honorii I. causa, Rome, 1870; Ruckgabe: Die Irrlehre d. H., Stuttgart, 1871; [E. F. Willis: Pope Honorius and the New Roman Dogma, London, 1879]. — Honorius II. (Cadulus, antipope 1081–84) was Bishop of Parma when Nicholas II. died, and was elected Pope by the Lombard bishops (Basel, 1081), under the influence of the Empress Agnes, in opposition to Alexander II. The German bishops, however, sided, not with the empress and her candidate, but with Hildebrand.
and Alexander II.; and May 31, 1064, a council was convened at Milan to decide upon the double election. Alexander II. appeared before the council, but not Honorius II., who was formally deposed. He did not give up, however, his claim upon the papal crown, though it was recognized only by the Lombard bishops. He died 1073.

See *Hist. eccl.* (*Augsburg, 1750*, 3 vols. fol.); *Reg. Pont. Rom.*, p. 549; *Watterich: Pont. Rom.*, T. II. p. 157. — Honorius III. (July 18, 1216–March 18, 1227) confirmed the order of the Dominicans in 1216, and that of the Franciscans in 1223, and crowned the emperor Frederick II. of Constantinople, and Friedrich II. emperor of Rome. In his relations with the latter he was very yielding and obliging, while he showed himself extraordinarily hard against Count Raymond of Toulouse. *His Opera omnia are found in Horas*: *Med. Ev. Bib. Patr.* (Paris, 1879, T. I.), and his letters in *Bouquet, Recueil des Historiens de Gaules et de la France*, XIX. p. 610. See the works on Friedrich II. by *Kestner* (Göttingen, 1873) and O. *Lorenz* (Berlin, 1876). — Honorius IV. (April 2, 1285–April 3, 1287) showed himself, in spite of his age and bodily debility, very energetic, both in internal administration and in foreign policy. See *Muratori*: *Reg. Ital. Script.*, III. p. 615.

**HONTER, Johann, b. at Cronstadt, Transylvania, 1498; d. there Jan. 23, 1549; studied at Vienna; was a teacher at Cracow and Basel, and returned to his native city in 1538, bringing with him the Renascence and the Reformation. From the printing-press which he established in his house, he issued a number of books of education, and was instrumental in the foundation of the gymnasium of Cronstadt. But of still greater importance were his *Formula reformatorius ecclesiae Coronensis* (1527), and his *Apologia reformationis*, (1543). In 1544 he became the minister of an evangelical congregation in Cronstadt. See G. D. *Teutsch*: *Ueber Honterus und Cronstadt zu seiner Zeit*, Hermannstadt, 1876.

**HONTHEIM, Johann Nicolaus von, b. at Treves, Jan. 27, 1701; d. there Sept. 2, 1780; studied history and canon law in his native city, at Louvain, and Leyden; visited Rome 1728; entered the service of the Church, and was appointed suffragan bishop of Treves in 1748. He wrote *Historia Treverina* (Augsburg, 1750, 3 vols. fol.) and *Prodromus Historiae Treverinae* (Augsburg, 1752, 2 vols. fol.). — He was a full-blooded specimen of the monkish obscurantism and fanaticism of his time. When he lost his case against Reuchlin, the Pope himself could not compel him to keep silent. His works appeared at Cologne, 1526. See *Reuchlin*. — HOOK, Walter Farquhar, D.D., F.R.S., b. in London, March 13, 1798; d. at Chichester, Wednesday, Oct. 20, 1875. He was educated at Oxford; took holy orders; was vicar of Leeds from 1837 to 1859, when he was appointed dean of Chichester. He was a sober High-Churchman. His long service in Leeds was singularly successful; for he was instrumental in erecting twenty-one churches, thirty-two parsonages, sixty schools, besides rebuilding the parish church at a cost of twenty-eight thousand pounds. In the midst of engrossing labors he found time to prepare a number of volumes, of which may be mentioned a *Church Dictionary* (12th ed., 1872), *An Ecclesiastical Biography* (1845–52, 8 vols.); *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury* (1860–76, 12 vols.).

**HOOKER, Richard, an eminent divine of the Church of England, and its most distinguished writer on ecclesiastical polity; b. near Exeter, about 1553; d. at Bishopsborne, Nov. 2, 1600. He was the son of poor parents, was educated by an uncle, and while at Oxford received aid from Bishop Jewel. An interesting incident in his life is his last meeting with the bishop. The latter lent Hooker his horse to carry him to Exeter, and gave him money for the journey. He acted as tutor at his university, in 1579 was appointed to deliver the Hebrew lecture, and in 1581 took orders. In his marriage, which occurred about this time, he was unfortunate. With characteristic lack of worldly wisdom, he confided to a Mrs. Churchman of London the care, which she had solicited, of selecting him, in short, of giving him a wife. "Hooker did give her such a power as Eleazer was trusted with (you may read it in the Book of Genesis) when he was sent to choose a wife for Isaac," etc. We may not blame Mrs. Churchman for hitting upon her daughter Joan; but we shall pity Hooker none the less for that. He was for many years at the household of Drayton Beauchamp, in the diocese of Lincoln, 1584, and the following year, at the recommendation of Archbishop Sandsy, to whose son Hooker immediately put on the Index; and, when the real author was discovered, persecutions began which finally compelled him to retract. Honthem's correspondence with the elector Clemens Wenzelaus of Treves was published at Francfort, 1818. See *müller-masis*: *Disquis. de J. N. H.*, Treves, 1838.
had acted as tutor at Oxford, master of the Temple, London. He shared the pulpit with Travers, a Genevan divine. Of the preaching of the two, Fuller says, "The congregation at the Temple ebbed in the forenoon [when Hooker preached], and flowed in the afternoon." He, however, suggests that Mr. Hooker "was too wise to take exception at such trifles." In 1591 Hooker went to Boscombe, and was made a minor prebend of Salisbury, and in 1595 was transferred to Bishopsborne, three miles from Canterbury, where he died.

Hooker was rather a tedious preacher, having an embarrassed manner, and his sentences being too prolix, and sometimes involved, for the pulpit. Yet Fuller quaintly says, "He may be said to have made good music with his fiddle and stick alone, without any rosin, having neither pronunciation nor grace to seize his matter." Hooker's great reputation rests upon his Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. It is composed of eight books, four of which were written in Boscombe, and published 1594, and the fifth in 1597. The last three books have an interesting history, which is given in full by Keble (pp. xii—xxv). Hooker's widow was accused of having burned the manuscript; but, whether justly or not, it was irrecoverably gone (Keble). The rough draughts, however, were preserved. The sixth and eighth were published in 1648, and the seventh in 1692. Of these the sixth is, according to Keble, probably not genuine. The other two contain the substance of what Hooker wrote. The immediate occasion of the Ecclesiastical Polity seems to have been an attack of Travers upon Hooker for extending salvation to Roman Catholics, and his lack of sympathy with Calvinism. With Jewel's Apology it is the most important original contribution to English ecclesiastical literature of the sixteenth century, and the first great ecclesiastical work written in English. Its style has been highly praised; and Green (History English People, iii. 80) speaks of "its grandeur and stateliness, which raised its author to the highest rank among English prose writers." Written in a very fine spirit, and with a fine thirst for thought, it is free from the multitudinous and often unsifted quotations which deface the pages of the theological works of the period; e.g., Jewel's Apology.

The contents are rather more philosophical than theological, and the work more valuable for its broad and fundamental principles than for exactness of definition, or clearness of argument. It is in effect an answer to Puritanism, which Hooker had been bitterly attacking the episcopal system through a generation. Conceived in an admirable temper, and free from the heat and vituperation which characterize so many of the controversial writings of the period, it makes no attempt to discredit the Presbyterian system. Its object is to assert the right of a broad liberty on the basis of Scripture and reason. He expressly denies that the practice of the apostles is a rule to be invariably followed, but that the contrary; circumstances warrant a departure from the government and discipline of the early church. He seeks to prove that things not commanded in Scripture may still be lawful, and he does it by appealing to the practice of the Puritans themselves (as in the case of the wafer which they used in common with the Roman Catholics, etc.). The assertion of this fundamental prerogative of reason is one of the most valuable contributions of the work. Hooker has been claimed as a champion of the High-Anglican doctrine of episcopacy, and, hardly less confidently, by the other side as the advocate of the view that church government is a matter of the interpretation of Scripture which can be found in favor of both, as even Keble qualifies it (p. xxxviii). But neither view is true. Hooker holds a position intermediate between the school of the English Reformers, Archbishop Grindal (d. 1588) and most of Elizabeth's bishops, and the school which grew up in the contest with Puritanism, and had its extreme representative in Archbishop Laud (1533-45). Had he been more exact in his definitions, it might be possible to place him more confidently on the one side or on the other. As it is, he stands as the representative of toleration in the sphere of ecclesiastical polity, and the advocate of the claims of reason against that narrow scripturalism which assumes to tolerate nothing which the Scriptures do not expressly command.

Besides the Ecclesiastical Polity, we are in possession of several of Hooker's Sermons. The first complete edition of his Works was by LUTON, London, 1662; the best is by KEBLE, Oxford, 1836, 4 vols., and often since. It contains an Introduction and Valuable Notes by the editor, and the genial Life of Hooker by IZAAC WALTER, which first appeared in 1695 to correct the errors in GARDEN'S Life (1692). D. B. SCHAFF.

HOOPER, John, bishop and martyr, b. in Somersetshire, 1495; d. at the stake Feb. 9, 1555, in Gloucester. He was educated at Merton College, Oxford, and entered the Cistercian order. A diligent study of the Scriptures and the works of Zwingli and Bullinger on the Pauline Epistles, convinced him of the errors of the Papal Church, and made him an ardent advocate of the Reformation. When, in 1539, the VI. OIT. (a so-called) Bloody Articles were enforced, he retired to the Continent, meeting at Strassburg the lady he subsequently married. Returning to England to secure funds from his father, he went back again in 1547 to the Continent, tarrying at Zurich, where he was received by Bullinger, and carried on a correspondence with Bucer, concerning the sacraments.

In 1548 Hooper returned to England, and immediately threw himself into an arduous activity, preaching at least once every day, and with great power. Foxe says of him, "In his sermons he corrected sin, and sharply inveighed against the iniquity of the world and the corrupt abuses of the church. The people in great flocks and companies came daily to hear him, so much that the church would oftentimes be so full, that none could enter further than the doors. In his doctrine he was earnest, in tongue eloquent, in Scripture perfect, in pains indefatigable." In 1550 he preached before the king once every week during Lent, and soon after was nominated to the see of Gloucester. But unexpected impediments interfered with his acceptance. Hooper had fully imbibed the spirit of the Continental Reformation, so that Canon Perry feels justified in calling him the "first Puritan confessor" (History of the Church of England, ii. 205). He had a strong aversion to clerical vestments, which he described
refused to take the oath of consecration, in which the obnoxious clause. The controversy became so heated, that Aarons and superstitious, and absolutely against those who used vestments, that he was sent to the Fleet. Bucer and Peter Martyr were talked of as potential candidates. They recommended Hooper to submit. Following their advice, he was consecrated March 8, 1551. It was prescribed that he should wear the vestments on public occasions, but at other times might use his own discretion.

In the administration of his episcopal office, Hooper was so indefatigable in preaching and visitation as to call for the friendly council of Bullinger and other friends to practise a prudent moderation. Foxe calls him "a spectacle (pattern) to all bishops." In 1552 he was appointed Bishop of Worcester in commendam. Hooper and Rogers were the first to be cited under Mary. On Aug. 29, 1553, the former was thrown into prison, where he received harsh treatment, and contracted sciatica. In January, 1555, he was condemned on three charges,—for maintaining the lawfulness of clerical marriage, for defending divorce, and for denying transubstantiation. He called the mass "the iniquity of the Devil." He was sentenced to die at the stake in Gloucester, whither he was conveyed. He met his death firmly and cheerfully. To a friend bearing his lot, the martyr replied in the oft-quoted words, "Death is bitter, and life is sweet, but alas! consider that death to come is more bitter, and life to come is more sweet." In another conversation, he said, "I am well, thank God; and death to me for Christ's sake is welcome." His martyrdom was witnessed by a large throng of people. The martyr was forbidden to address the crowd. A real or pretended pardon being promised if he would recant, he spurned it away, saying, "If you love my soul, away with it." His agony was greatly prolonged and increased by the slow progress of the fire on account of the green fagots, which had to be rekindled three times before they did their work.

Lit. — Hooper's works have been edited by the Parker Society (with a biography) in two volumes, Cambridge, 1845-52, and by the Religious Tract Society in one volume. The more important are A Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian Faith; A Declaration of Christ and his Office; A Declaration of the Ten Commandments; Seven Sermons on Jonah; and An Answer to Bishop Gardiner, being a Detection of the Devil's Sophistry whereewith he robeth the unlearned people of the true belief in the most blessed Sacrament of the Altar. Foxe, in the Book of Martyrs, gives a minute and impressive account of Hooper's life, and dwells at length upon the events of his martyrdom. D. S. Schaff.

HOORNBEK, Johannes, b. at Harlem, 1817; d. at Leyden, 1858. He was appointed minister at Utrecht 1844, and professor of theology at Leyden 1854, and wrote Sociannm s confutatis (1850), Examen bullae papalis, etc. (1652), Epistola de Independentismo (1659), etc.

HÔPITAL (Hospitall), Michel de L', b. at Aigueperse, in Auvergne, 1506; d. on his estate of Vignay, near Stamps, March 13, 1579; studied law at Padua, and was successively auditor of the Rota, French plenipotentiary at the Council of Bologna, chancellor to the Duchess of Berry, and finally Chancellor of France (1560-70), in which position he exercised a great and beneficial influence. Although he remained a member of the Roman Church, his great aim was to find a modus vivendi at once acceptable to the Romanists and the Reformed; and in the pursuit of this aim he arranged the conferences of Poissy (1561) and St. Germain (1562), drew up the January edict (1562), mediated the peace of Amboise (1569), labored for the rejection of the canons of the Council of Trent, negotiated the peace of Longjumeau (1568), etc. His letters were published at Liège, 1585; his Latin poems, in Amsterdam, 1732; his collected works, in Paris, 1824-26, 5 vols. See the sketch of his life, by Villemaur, in Études d'histoire moderne, Paris, 1882; Guer: Die Kirchenpolitik M. d. L'H., Duisburg, 1877.

TH. SCHOTT.

HOPKINS, Albert, b. in Stockbridge, Mass., July 14, 1807; was graduated at Williams College 1828; became a tutor in the college 1827, professor of mathematics and natural philosophy 1829-38, and of natural philosophy and astronomy 1838, till his death; d. in Williamsport, May 24, 1872. The events of his life were of a wholly extraordinary character. In 1832 he established in college a noon prayer-meeting of a half-hour, held on four days of the week; and he maintained it for forty years. Although licensed to preach the gospel in 1838, and preaching frequently since, it was not until Dec. 26, 1869, that he was formally ordained. His last days were largely devoted to pastoral work, but not to the neglect of his college duties. His monument is the Church of Christ in the White Oaks (a district in the north-east part of Williamsport), which was the result of his efforts, and which was organized Dec. 20, 1869; but previously he had led the way to, and efficiently aided in, the erection of a chapel there, which was dedicated Oct. 25, 1866. Acquaintance with Professor Hopkins was a means of grace. He was pre-eminent a man of faith, and impressed all he met by his unworldly life. At the same time he was an excellent teacher, and a man of enterprise and push. See his Life by Albert C. Sewall, New York (1879).

HOPKINS, John Henry, D.D., D.C.L. (Oxford), Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Vermont; b. in Dublin, Jan. 30, 1792; came to this country when he was eight years old; d. at Rock Point, Vt., Jan. 9, 1868. In 1817 he was admitted to the bar, but in 1823 entered the ministry, and in 1832 was elected Bishop of Vermont, accepting at the same time the rectorship of St. Paul's, Burlington. Bishop Hopkins was a zealous High Churchman, and refused to sign a protest of the majority of the American bishops against Romanizing tendencies. He was an advocate of slavery, and in 1863 published Vindication of Slavery. Among his other many writings are...
History of the Confessinals (New York, 1850), and Refutation of Milner's End of Controvertiy, in a Series of Letters to the Roman Archbishop of Baltimore (Kenrick), 2 vols., 1854.

HOPKINS, Samuel, D.D., b. in Waterbury, Conn., Sept. 17, 1721; d. in Newport, R.I., Dec. 20, 1808, in the eighty-third year of his life, and the twenty-second of his ministry. As a child he was remarkable for his purity and ingenuousness. He entered Yale College in September, 1737. Here he devoted himself specially to logic and mathematics. Here he began his Christian life, during the religious interest attending the services of Whitefield and Gilbert Tennent at New Haven. In 1741 he commenced his theological studies, under the care and in the family of President Edwards, then of Northampton, Mass. He was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in Great Barrington, Mass., Dec. 28, 1743. When he was ordained, the church consisted of only five members: a hundred and sixty joined it during his pastorate. After a ministry of twenty-five years, he was dismissed Jan. 15, 1769. His ministry was sometimes interrupted by the French and Indian wars, which compelled him to remove with his family to other towns for safety. He preached often to the Housatonic Indians in his neighborhood. His hundred and sixtieth written sermon to them is still preserved in manuscript. He was so successful in his ministry among them, that he was invited to become their missionary. With all his fondness for study, he was never happier than when preaching to the poor. While at Great Barrington, he remained intimate with President Edwards so long as Edwards was at Northampton, and became still more intimate with him when Edwards removed to Stockbridge. At this time he was better acquainted than any other man with the peculiar views of Edwards. He also held frequent and fraternal intercourse with Dr. Bellamy of Bethlehem, Conn. He exerted a marked influence on several men who afterwards became eminent; as on Dr. Jonathan Edwards, the son of the president, and on Dr. Stephen West of Stockbridge, Mass. He spent commonly fourteen, and occasionally eighteen, hours a day at his study-table. So thorough was his theological training that he was named as a candidate for a professorship of divinity in Princeton College, and afterward for the presidency of the college.

He was installed pastor of the First Congregational Church in Newport, R.I., April 11, 1770, and continued in this pastorate thirty-three years. Soon after his installation he was gratified with a visit from his friend, George Whitefield, the great Whitefield. When he removed to Stockbridge, he was more successful as a writer. By his love for study, his patient and unremitting perseverance of his mind, by his honesty, humility, benevolence, his deferential study of the Bible, and his habit of communion with God, he was eminently fitted to be a theologian. He left his theological system with just those faults which might be expected from an original thinker, with just those faults which might be expected from a positive thinker. His faults were a want of completeness and symmetry, also a bold and positive style where caution and reserve were more apposite. His system was essentially Calvinistic, but was distinguished by the epithet "Hopkinsian." (See Hopkinsianism.)

He is said to have spent six years in studying the writings of President Edwards, all of whose manuscripts, by the president's request, were committed to the care of Hopkins. He superintended the publication of Edwards's Treatise on Original Sin, 1758. He edited and published
seventeen of Edwards's Sermons (1784), the two
dissertations on The End for which God created the
World and on The Nature of True Virtue (1765); and he
prepared for the press several other of the
president's works. The theological writings of
Hopkins himself were (titles abbreviated),
The Wisdom of God in the Permission of Sin (1758),
An Inquiry concerning the Promises of the Gospel
(1765), The True State and Character of the Unre-
generate (1768), Animadversions on Mr. Hart's late
Dialogues, written in opposition to Dr. Hop-
kins's writings (1770), An Inquiry into the Nature
of True Holiness (1773), An Inquiry concerning the
Future State of those who die in their Sins (1783),
A System of Doctrines contained in Divine Revela-
tion (2 vols. 8vo, 1793), A Dialogue between a
Calvinist and a Semi-Calvinist (1805), published
after the author's death. Among his printed
sermons were one on The Divinity of Christ
(1708), two on Law and Regeneration (1788), A
Volume of Twenty-one Sermons, edited by Dr. Daniel
Hopkins (1805). The biographies published by
Hopkins were The Life and Character of Presi-
dent Edwards, prefixed to Edwards's seventeen
sermons (1784), The Life and Character of Miss
Swanna Anthony (1796), Memoirs of the Life of
Mrs. Sarah Osborn (1799). His political writings
were chiefly anonymous. In 1786 he published
his noted Dialogue concerning the Slavery of the
Africans, together with his Address to Slaveshold-
ers. It is estimated, that if his essays and let-
ters on African emancipation, and his elaborate
letters to Andrew Fuller, John Ryland, Drs.
Davies and Bellamy on religious themes, were
printed, they would form a large volume. Many
of his printed works were reprinted in 1834 by the
Doctrinal Tract and Book Society (now Con-
gregational Board of Publication) at Boston, in
three octavo volumes, containing over two thou-
sand pages. In 1805 appeared the Autobiography
of Dr. Hopkins with an Introduction by Dr. Stephen
West; in 1830, a Memoir of Dr. Hopkins by Rev.
John Foote; in 1845, a Memoir of Dr. Hopkins
by Rev. Dr. William Patten; in 1854, a
Memoir, containing 266 pages, 8vo, by the
undersigned.

EDWARDS A. PARK.

HOPKINSIANISM. The roots of this theo-
ological system lie embedded in the published and
unpublished writings of the elder Jonathan Ed-
wards: hence it has been called the "Edwar
dean Divinity." The main principles of it are either
taught or implied in the writings of Dr. Samuel
Hopkins of Newport, R.I., the earliest of whose
publications were sanctioned by the elder Ed-
wards and Dr. Bellamy. Those principles which
are merely implied in his system have been un-
folded and somewhat modified by his three friends,
Dr. Stephen West, Dr. Nathanael Emmons, and
Dr. Samuel Spring. As logically connected with
each other, and as understood by the majority of
its advocates, the system contains the following
principles. (1) Every moral agent choosing right
has as his natural power to choose right, and
choosing wrong has the natural power to choose
right. (2) He is under no obligation to perform an
act, unless he has the natural ability to perform it.
(3) Although in the act of choosing, every man is
as free as any moral agent can be, yet he is acted
upon while he acts freely, and the divine provi-
dence, as well as decree, extends to all his wrong
as really as to his right volitions. (4) All sin is
so overruled by God as to become the occasion
of good to the universe. (5) The holiness and the
sinfulness of every moral agent belong to him
personally and exclusively, and cannot be imput-
ed in a literal sense to any other agent. (6) As
the holiness and the sin of man are exercises of
his will, there is neither holiness nor sin in his
nature viewed as distinct from these exercises.
(7) As all his moral acts before regeneration are
certain to be entirely sinful, no promise of regen-
ernating grace is made to any of them. (8) The
impassive sinner is obligated, and should be
exhorted, to cease from all impenitent acts, and
to begin a holy life at once. His moral inability
to obey this exhortation is not a literal inability,
but is a mere certainty, that, while left to himself,
he will sin; and this certainty is no reason for his
not being required and urged to abstain immedi-
ately from all sin. (9) Every impenitent sinner
should be willing to suffer the punishment which
God wills to inflict upon him. In whatever sense
he should submit to the divine justice punishing
other sinners, in that sense he should submit to the
divine justice punishing himself. In what-
ever sense the punishment of the finally obdurate
promotes the highest good of the universe, in that
sense he should be submissive to the divine will
in punishing himself, if finally obdurate. This
principle is founded mainly on the two follow-
ing. (10) All holiness consists in the elective
preference of the greater above the smaller, and
all sin consists in the elective preference of the
smaller above the greater, good of sentient beings.
(11) All the moral attributes of God are compre-
hended in general benevolence, which is essenti-
ally the same with general justice, and includes
simple, complacent, and composite benevo-

lence; legislative, retributive, and public justice.
(12) The atonement of Christ consists not in his
enduring the punishment threatened by the law,
nor in his performing the duties required by the
law, but in his manifesting and honoring by his
pains, and especially by his death, all the divine
attributes which would have been manifested in
the same and no higher degree by the punish-
ment of the redeemed. (13) The atonement was
made for all men, the non-elect as really as the
elect.

The epithet "Hopkinsian" was invented in
1709 or 1770 by Rev. William Hart of Saybrook,
Conn., and was applied, not to the whole system
of Dr. Hopkins, but to the principles marked 7
and 8 above. As a whole, Hopkinsianism has
been distinguished by the prominence which it
gives to the sterner class of truths; as the decrees
and sovereignty of God, the eternity of future
punishment, etc. It has prepared the way for
giving this prominence by introducing a differ-
ent class of principles; as the equity of God in
adapting his law to the natural ability of men,
his infinite worthiness in making benevolence the
sum of all his moral state, the beauty of his
holiness as consisting in the choice of the greater
above the smaller good of the universe, etc. On
account of the prominence which it gives to the
former class of principles, it has been criticised as
Hyper-Calvinism: on account of its adopting the
latter class, it has been criticised since 1772 as
Arminian and Pelagian. By combining the two
classes, and developing their consistency with each other and with the uses of the pulpit, it has claimed the title of "Consistent Calvinism." The substance of it has been now incorporated with what is termed "New-England Theology" (see art.).

EDWARDS A. PARK.

HOR, Mount (the mountain). There are two mountains of this name in Scripture. The first, called by the Arabs Jebel Nebi Harun ("the mountain of the prophet Aaron"), is on the boundary-line of Edom (Num. xx. 28), midway between the Dead Sea and the Gulf of Akabah, and is forty-eight hundred feet high. It has two peaks; and on one of these, or, as some suppose, on the level space between them, from whence he could be seen by all the people, Aaron died (Num. xx. 27, 28). The tomb (Kâbûr Harûn) now shown to travellers as his is a small building twenty-eight by thirty-three feet, surrounded by a white boundary-line, the usual mark of a saint's resting-place. The interior of the tomb consists of two rooms, one above the other. The upper one has in it a stone sarcophagus: the ceiling is supported by four pillars. The lower room is reached by a flight of steps, and is perfectly dark. At one end, through a grating, is shown what purports to be the real tomb.

The second Mount Hor (Num. xxxiv. 7, 8) was between the Mediterranean and the "entrance of Hamath," but has not been further identified.

HORBE, Johann Heinrich, b. at Colmar, in Alsace, June 11, 1645; d. at Steinbeck, near Hamburg, Jan. 29, 1695; studied theology at Strassburg, where, among others, he also had Spener for his teacher; visited afterwards the universities of Jena, Leipzig, Wittenberg, Helmstedt, and Kiel; travelled in Holland, England, and France, and was in 1671 appointed pastor at Trarbach on the Mosel. The boldness with which he expounded and carried out into practice his pietistic views brought him into collision with his colleagues, and in 1678 he was dismissed. In the following year he was appointed pastor of Hierborn in Franconia, and in 1684 pastor of St. Nicholas in Hamburg. In the last position he found many adherents, but also many adversaries; and the distribution of Die Klugheit der Gerechten, a translation of a pamphlet by the French mystic Pierre Poiret, raised such a storm against him that he was deprived of the pulpit. He retired to Steinbeck, where he died. A list of his writings is found in J. Müller: Cimbria literaria, II., pp. 355-372. See also J. Geffcken: Johann Winkler and die Hamburghische Kirche, Hamburg, 1861.

HORCHE, Heinrich, b. at Eschwege, Oct. 20, 1780; d. there Jan. 27, 1829. He was educated at Christian's Hospital (1798-95), and then was a barrister's clerk; but in 1808 he became sub-librarian to the Surrey Institution, in 1814 librarian; was admitted to holy orders 1819; and in 1824-60, made B.D. by Cambridge 1829. Among his other works was a volume of Letters on Infidelity (1784), in which he criticises Hume's arguments. See The Works of B. Horne, with his Life, by William Jones, London, 1795-99, 6 vols., and 1831, 4 vols.

HORNA, Thomas Hartwell, b. in London, Oct. 20, 1780; d. there Jan. 27, 1829. He was educated at Christ's Hospital (1798-95), and then was a barrister's clerk; but in 1808 he became sub-librarian to the Surrey Institution, in 1814 librarian; was admitted to holy orders 1819; was senior assistant librarian in the British Museum, 1831-60, by which date he was senior assistant librarian; and in 1833 was appointed rector of the united parishes of St. Edmund the King, and St. Nicolas Acoa, in London. He gave early evidence of his literary ability in his Brief View of the Necessity and Truth of the Christian Religion (1800; 2d ed., 1802), and wrote very many pamphlets and volumes; but the work by which he is remembered is An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, London, 1818, 3 vols., 2d ed., vol. 2 revised by Rev. Samuel Davidson, D.D., and vol. 3 by Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, LL.D., 1856, 4 vols. in 5. But Dr. Davidson's "rationalism" led to the rejection of his work, and the substitution of the revision of vol. 2 by Rev. John Ayre. The fourteenth edition of the work appeared 1877; there is also an American reprint of a former edition. Horne's Introduction is the most famous book of its class. It covers the entire field of biblical learning,—not only general and special introduction proper, but hermeneutics, apologetics, biblical geography, natural history, etc. It has been of inestimable value to the Church, and the means of turning many persons unto profound Bible study. The Bibliographical
HORNEY.
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Appendix to the Introduction is the best thing of its kind as yet published in English.

HORNEY, or HORNEJUS, Conrad, b. at Brunswick, Nov. 25, 1690; d. at Helmstadt, Sept. 26, 1649; studied philosophy and theology, first in his native place, afterwards at Helmstadt, where he was professor of philosophy in 1619, and of theology in 1628. His Compendium diaeticum (1623), Philosophia moralis (1624), Theologia, and Hist. Eccles. (the two last published after his death), were much used as text-books, not only at Helmstadt, but also in other universities.

HORROLOQUIUM (ὁρολογίον, "a dial"), an office-book of the Greek Church, corresponding to the Latin breviary, and containing the office for the day and night hours of the Church, from matin to compline, with the variable antiphons and hymns, and various short offices, prayers, and canons, for occasional use.

HORSLEY, Samuel, a learned and eloquent prelate of the Church of England; b. in London, 1733; d. at Brighton, Oct. 4, 1806. His father was a minister, and personally supervised his education till he entered Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated LL.B. in 1758. His first charge in the ministry was Newington in Surrey. In 1767 he was elected to the Royal Society, and was secretary of that body from 1773 to 1784, when he resigned his membership, on account of difficulties with the president. He was an able classical scholar and mathematician, published works in both departments, and edited Horsley's Theological Works (London, 1830, 9 vols.), and his Sermons, complete in 1 vol. (London, 1839). See Stanley: Memorials of Westminster Abbey; and Stoughton: Religion in England, vi., 170 sqq.

HOSEA (יָהָסָא, "help"), a Hebrew prophet, was the son of Beeri. Of his life nothing certain is known than what may be inferred from his prophecy. Tradition is singularly reticent concerning him. The prophet was married, and had three children. His marriage is not to be explained as an allegory [some of the fathers, Hosea, and others], nor resolved into a vision [Hengstenberg, etc.] He belonged to the kingdom of Israel, as is evident from vii. 5, where he calls the king of Israel "our king," and from the contents of the prophecy, which display a familiar acquaintance with the affairs of the Northern Kingdom.

The Book of Hosea is divided into two parts,—i.—iii. and iv.—xiv. In chapter i. it is told how, in obedience to the divine command, the prophet married a "wife of whoredoms" (Gomer), who bore him a daughter ("Not having obtained Mercy") and two sons ("Jezreel" and "Not my People"). These three names are plainly symbolic of God's displeasure. Chapter ii. promises reconciliation with the people, notwithstanding their alienation from him. The new and pleasant names are substituted,—"My People," and "Having obtained Mercy." But between the displeasure and reconciliation a period was to intervene (iii.) in which Israel should be punished for its spiritual adultery, and led by sorrows to seek again the Lord.

The second part (iv.—xiv.) contains a series of punitive and threatening discourses. The first of these (iv.) describes the deep moral fall of the land, in which the leaders and priests were also involved. In the second (v.—vi. 3), the prophet urges the responsibility of the priests for the spiritual declension and the divine punishment, in spite of the help sought from foreign nations, and closes with the scene of the people's returning wounded to the Lord for healing. This section belongs to the reign of Shalum, who reigned only one month (v. 7). If this be granted, then the former section belongs to the reign of Zachariah. The third discourse (vi. 4—vii. 16) contains a reproof of Ephraim, who is unstable, wanders off from God, and seeks aid from Egypt and Assyria. As Hitzig has rightly pointed out, vii. 7 enables us to fix the time of this discourse pretty accurately in the reign of Menahem. The fourth discourse (viii. i—ix. 9) again lays bare the spiritual adultery of Israel, and lifts a warning voice. It evidently belongs to the reign of Menahem, who leaned upon Assyria (viii. 4). The fifth discourse (ix. 10—xi. 11) three times shows how Israel had returned God's goodness by turning to idols. If, as is very probable, x. 14 refers to Shalmaneser, then this prophecy was spoken under King Hoshea. The last discourse (xii. 1—xiv. 9), which closes with an earnest exhortation to the people to repent, and the announcement of a divine promise, belongs also to the reign of Hoshea, and before the fall of the Northern Kingdom.

To sum up, we have here a series of prophecies reaching from the last years of Jeroboam II.,
king of Israel, into the reign of Hosea; so that there is no good reason for denying the genuineness of the superscription (i. 1), as some have done [or from about 794 to 726 B.C.]. That the prophecies of Hosea have been handed down to us in their integrity, has with reason been emphasized by Ewald.

Hosea is closely related to Amos, his older contemporary, as is evident by a comparison of Hos. iv. 3, and Amos viii. 8; Hos. iv. 15, and Amos v. 8; Hos. v. 7, and Amos vii. 4, etc. But, closely related as the prophets are, the differences in their language and manner of representation are marked. Hosea's style is full of rare words (ii. 4, 12, viii. 6, etc.), verbal forms and expressions (iv. 4, ix. 1, etc.). In other respects, also, they differ. Amos is more gentle, Hosea more robust. His mind, as Umbreit asss, "moves, profoundly agitated, under the burden, divinely imposed, of preaching against the sins of his people, and announcing their fall. Hence the abruptness of his discourse, the disconnectedness of the sentences, and the peculiar character of the figures, which follow each other rapidly, and without being rounded out; so that Jerome was right when he said Hosea was concise, and spoke, as it were, in detached, unconnected sentences (commutus est et quasi per sententias loquens). Notwithstanding, however, the dark flood of ire which the book reveals to our gaze, it also unveils a light of reconciling love of surpassing beauty, which ever and anon shines upon the adulterous people. And in this combination liesthe peculiar splendor of our prophet."


HOSHE'A (God is help), the son of Elah, and the last and best of the kings of Israel, headed a conspiracy against Pekah, slew him, and seized the throne (2 Kings xv. 30). But he was unable to stay the fall of his kingdom. At the very beginning of his reign he was compelled to pay tribute to Assyria (2 Kings xvii. 3); and in his ninth year he was invaded by the Assyrian king, because he had attempted an alliance with Egypt. Samaria was taken, after a three-years' siege, and a large part of the people carried away to Assyria (xxvii. 6), and the kingdom was newly peopled (xxvii. 24, cf. Hos. xiii. 16, Mic. i. 6). It would seem that the king who began the siege of Samaria was Shalmaneser; the king who took it was Sargon; the Egyptian king, who is called So, was Sevechus, the second king of the twenty-fifth Ethiopian dynasty.

HOSIUS, generally called Osilus by Latin writers; b. 256; d. 359; was Bishop of Corduba (Cordova), in Spain, for over fifty years. He was present at the synod of Elvira (305 or 306), and agreed in its severe canons concerning the lapse, the marriage of ecclesiastics, and other points of discipline. Some years later on he appears at the court of Constantine the Great as a man of great influence. He brought personally the emperor's letter to Bishop Alexander of Alexandria, and Arius, exhorting them to refrain from disturbing the Church by their disputes; and he was, no doubt, instrumental in the convention of the first ecumenical council of Nicaea (325), where he played a prominent part. On the death of his administration of his diocese, nothing is known: but he remained the firm friend of Athanasius and his cause in the Western Church; and when Constantius, in 353, endeavored to establish peace in the Church by openly favoring the Arians, Hosius refused not only to condemn Athanasius, but also to enter into communion with the Arians. The demand was made by the emperor; and Hosius refused again in a dignified letter, reminding the emperor, that, though the realm belonged to him, the Church belonged to the bishops. Hosius was then banished to Sirmium; and, by a synod held there in 357, he was induced to subscribe the second Sirmian formula, involving communion with the Arians, but not the condemnation of Athanasius. After his return to Corduba, he retracted, however. Of his writings, only the above-mentioned letter has come down to us. ATHANASIUS: Ad Monach.; Dake: Synod of Elvira, 1882. W. Möllers.
HOSPITALITY AMONG THE HEBREWS.

This virtue was practised and held in the highest esteem among Israel and throughout the East. When a stranger appeared, he was invited into the house or tent. As soon as he arrived, he was furnished with water to wash his feet, received a supply of needful food for himself and his beast, and enjoyed courtesy and protection from his host (Gen. xviii. 2 sq., xix. 1 sq., xxiv. 25, 31 sq.; Exod. ii. 20; Judg. xiii. 15, xix. 20 sq., 23). To leave a stranger outside in the street was a disgrace to the whole community (Judg. xix. 15). In absence, the stranger was considered discreditable (Job xxxi. 32). The religious hatred existing between Jews and Samaritans destroyed the mutual relations of hospitality (Luke ix. 53; John iv. 9); and onl in the greatest extremity would the Jew partake of Samaritan food, and if furnished with water to wash his feet, received a grace to the whole community (Judg. xix. 15), and enjoyed courtesy and protection from his host.

HOSPITALITY. HOSPITALS. The idea of honoring and serving Christ in the person of the unfortunate and diseased has manifested deeply impressed the Church. From the beginning, Christians have been proverbial for the care they have displayed for the weak. The deacons and deaconesses of the early Church visited the sick in their homes, but not they alone; and, even in times of persecution and of pestilence, all Christians joined in such pious duties. Care of the sick was unremitting. When the ban of the State was lifted from the Church, then buildings for the reception of the sick, the needy, and the stranger, began to be erected in all parts of the empire. And these came directly under the care of the bishops, who, of course, employed others to manage the details. Indeed, the Code of Justinian made their employment of superintendents obligatory. Basil the Great (330-379) seems to have built the most complete institution of the kind. In it there were accommodations even for lepers. The Emperor Julian was stirred up by the example of the Christians to provide on a generous scale for the sick. Later Placidia, the wife of Theodosius the Great, is mentioned by Theodoret (Hist. Eec., v. 18) as devoting much time to hospital service, doing even menial duties. The first person to build a hospital in Rome was Fabiola, one of Jerome's converts, who, out of penitence for a constructive sin (a second marriage after divorce on the ground of her husband's adultery, which was contrary to church law), gave all her property to charitable uses. Jerome himself had previously built a hospital in Bethlehem. There is notice of hospitals in Gaul in the fifth century; in Germany in the eighth or ninth century. The Irish missions of the latter period built them in different parts of Northern Europe in connection with their monasteries: hence they were called "Hospitallia Scolorum: i.e., Irish Hospitals.

It is a striking fact, mentioned by Martigny, that "hospitals were in ancient times commonly dedicated to the Holy Spirit, which was represented under the form of a dove, either on the facade, or on some other conspicuous part of the building." The principal hospital in Rome bears this designation, and has borne it from a very remote period.

See the arts. Hopitaux, in Martigny's Dict. des antiq. chrét., and in Lichtenberger's Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses, and Hospitals, in Smith and Cheetham's Dict. of Christian Antiquities.

HOSPITAL SISTERS. See HOSPITALLERS.

HOSSBACH, Peter Wilhelm, b. at Wusterhausen, in the province of Prussia, Feb. 20, 1784; studied theology at Halle and Francfort-on-the-Oder, and was appointed pastor, first of Planitz, near his native town, then at the military academy, and finally at the Church of Jerusalem in Berlin, where he died April 7, 1846. Besides several collections of sermons (1822-48), he published Das Leben J. V. Andreas (1819) and Sperner und seine Zeit (1828), both of which hold a high rank among historical monographs.
HOST. See Mass.

HOTTENTOTS, Christian Missions among the, were begun by George Schmidt, a Moravian missionary, who arrived at Cape Town in 1737. Although he spoke through an interpreter, his success was great, and therefore the colonial government interfered. In 1744 he returned to Europe in order to have his grievances removed; but in this he was not only unsuccessful, but the Dutch East India Company, which governed the colony, did not even allow him to return. It was not until 1792 that the mission was resumed by three other Moravian missionaries, and, until 1795, carried on amid formidable opposition on the part of the colonists. Since 1806 the colony has been under British government; and the mission has not been disturbed, and is now in a flourishing condition. But the Moravians have not been alone upon the field. The London Missionary Society, in 1798, sent thither two missionaries—Dr. Vanderkemp and Mr. Edmonds. The Wesleyan Missionary Society began operations in 1814; and other societies have since come in. The success of their work refutes the Portuguese notion that the Hottentots were a race of apes, incapable of Christianization. Low as they are in the scale of civilization, they are still soil for the gospel-seed, and bear precious increase. The gospel of Christ makes of the Hottentot a hero and a saint. For a full account of the language, history, and geographic and ethnographic relations of the Hottentots, see art. in Encyclopedia Britannica, 9th ed., vol. iii. 309-313. For their religion, see T. HAHN: Tsum' IlGoam, the Supreme Being of the Khoi-Khoi, London, 1882.

HOTTINGER is the name of a Swiss family which has produced several notable theologians.

—Johann Heinrich Hottinger, b. in Zürich, March 10, 1620; d. there June 5, 1687; studied theology and Oriental languages in Geneva, Groningen, and Leyden; was appointed professor of theology in his native city 1641; and wrote, among other works, Exercitationes Anti-Morinianae de Pentateuco Samaritano (1644), and Historia Eccles. Novi Test. (1651-67, 9 vols).—Johann Jacob Hottinger, son of the preceding; b. in Zürich, Dec. 1, 1652; d. there Dec. 18, 1735; studied in Basel and Geneva; was appointed professor of theology in his native city 1704; and wrote Heliastische Kirchengesch. (1688-1729, 4 vols. quarto).—Johann Jacob Hottinger, a relative of the preceding; b. in Zürich, May 18, 1783; was professor of history there, and died there May 18, 1800. He continued Johann von Müller's work on the history of Switzerland, and gave a valuable representation of the introduction of the Reformation in Switzerland.

HOUBIGANT, Charles François, b. in Paris, 1808; d. there 1783; entered the Congregation of the Oratory in 1704; served as teacher in various colleges, but retired in 1723 on account of complete deafness, and devoted himself to literary pursuits. His principal works are Racines Hebraiques (1782), in mnemonic verses, and Biblica Hebraica, with a Latin translation and critical notes (1753, 4 vols.), published at the expense of the Oratory.

HOUSÉ, Canonical. See Canonical Hours.

HOUSE AMONG THE HEBREWS. See Architecture, Hebrew.

HOUSE-COMMUNION, or PRIVATE COMMUNION, particularly in the case of the sick, cannot claim apostolic precedent, but came in very early; for the deacons were accustomed to carry the consecrated elements immediately after service to the sick prisoners, and to strangers. Tertullian, in the third century, testifies to the practice of private communion on the part of well persons (Ad uz., 2, 5, de or., 19 [Eng. trans. in Ante-Nicene Library, Tert., vol. i. pp. 198, 298]). In Greek churches there was private communion under both kinds. In Tertullian's time it would seem the bread alone was used at home, and eaten in the family-circle at morning-prayer. Later on, we find consecrated bread carried upon journeys, and used as an amulet; so much so, that councils protested against the practice. On the development of the doctrine of transubstantiation, the cup was rendered the only element, and the present form of communion for the sick introduced.

The Reformed and the Lutheran churches differ upon this point of private communion; the former repressing, and the latter freely allowing it. The Protestant pastor is oft-times confronted with practical difficulties when asked to dispense communion to the sick, and should therefore act cautiously, inquiring carefully into the condition of the sick person, so as to be assured that the service is intelligently and reverently participated in, and not superstitiously as a preservative against future ills.

HOWARD, John, the eminent apostle of prison-reform; b. at Hackney, near London, Sept. 2, 1726; d. at Cherson, on the Black Sea, Jan. 20, 1790. He was apprenticed to a grocer; but falling heir at the age of nineteen, by his father's death, to an ample fortune, he turned his back on commercial pursuits, and started on a tour to the Continent. On his return he was married to a lady much older than himself, who, however, lived only a few years after the event. In 1756 he took passage to Lisbon; but the vessel was captured by a French privateer, and Howard cast into a dungeon at Brest. The accommodations were wretched, and the provisions scant and ill-served, the meat being thrown in amongst the prisoners, which extended for them to tear it into pieces as best they could. He was transferred to Morlaix, but, released on parole, returned to England. The same year (1756) he was made fellow of the Royal Society for some communications on meteorology. About this time he married again, and spent a quiet life at his seat in Cardington (where he instituted laudable measures for the improvement of the condition of his tenants) until his wife's death, in 1765. He now began to tour the Continent. On his return he was married to a lady much older than himself, who, however, lived only a few years after the event. In 1756 he took passage to Lisbon; but the vessel was captured by a French privateer, and Howard cast into a dungeon at Brest. The accommodations were wretched, and the provisions scant and ill-served, the meat being thrown in amongst the prisoners, which extended for them to tear it into pieces as best they could. He was transferred to Morlaix, but, released on parole, returned to England. The same year (1756) he was made fellow of the Royal Society for some communications on meteorology. About this time he married again, and spent a quiet life at his seat in Cardington (where he instituted laudable measures for the improvement of the condition of his tenants) until his wife's death, in 1765. He now began to tour the Continent. On his return he was married to a lady much older than himself, who, however, lived only a few years after the event. In 1756 he took passage to Lisbon; but the vessel was captured by a French privateer, and Howard cast into a dungeon at Brest. The accommodations were wretched, and the provisions scant and ill-served, the meat being thrown in amongst the prisoners, which extended for them to tear it into pieces as best they could. He was transferred to Morlaix, but, released on parole, returned to England. The same year (1756) he was made fellow of the Royal Society for some communications on meteorology. About this time he married again, and spent a quiet life at his seat in Cardington (where he instituted laudable measures for the improvement of the condition of his tenants) until his wife's death, in 1765. He now began to tour the Continent. On his return he was married to a lady much older than himself, who, however, lived only a few years after the event. In 1756 he took passage to Lisbon; but the vessel was captured by a French privateer, and Howard cast into a dungeon at Brest.
heads and parliaments, and have won for his name a place, with those of Wilberforce and Mrs. Fry, among the noblest philanthropists of his country. The office of occasion of his visiting the jails of Bedford County; and the state of his mind in regard to them is summed up in his own words: "I beheld scenes of calamity which I grew daily more and more anxious to alleviate. Not only were the accommodations miserable, but the patients exposed to the mercy of unsalaried jailers, who drew their support from the fees of their wards, and had power to detain them till these were paid. In November, 1773, he began visiting the jails of the adjoining counties in order to find a precedent for putting the jailers of Bedford upon salaries,—a measure which he strenuously urged upon the authorities. These investigations, which were gradually pushed further and further, till he had visited the most of the county jails in England and in Ireland and Scotland (1775), strengthened in his mind the conviction of the urgent call for remedial measures. The rooms were, in part, underground and damp, and, as a rule, gloomy and filthy; in one case the common sewer of the city running directly under one of the prisons, and uncovered. The bedding, if any, was usually confined to straw, and the rations unhealthy and insufficient. Jaundice, and small-pox in its most virulent form, were common diseases. In 1774 he was called to testify before the committee of the House of Commons. That body passed a resolution "recognizing the humanity and zeal which had led him to visit the several jails in this kingdom," and the same year passed two bills for the better treatment of prisoners, and care of jails. In the spring of 1775 Howard visited Paris, where, after much perseverance, he succeeded in getting admission to the jails, which he describes as "beyond imagination horrid and dreadful." He also travelled through Switzerland, Germany, Belgium, and Holland, finding in the last two countries prison accommodations in a comparatively good state. On his return to England he published a work on the State of the Prisons in England and Wales, with Preliminary Observations, etc. In the years which immediately followed, he extended his visits to Sweden, Russia, Hungary, and every other country in Europe, everywhere pursuing the one philanthropic passion of his life.

The last five years of Howard's life were spent in measures for the mitigation of the horrors of the plague. With this design he visited, in 1785, the lazarettos of various cities of Italy, went as far as Smyrna, and travelled unknown on vessels infected with the plague in order to be able the better to find out the character of the treatment of the disease, and the nature of the quarantine regulations. In 1789, on his last sojourn in England, he published an Account of the Principal Lazarettos in Europe, etc. These latter years were saddened by the wild course of an only son, who lost his reason; but once again he started on a journey to the Continent, reached Cherson on the Black Sea, caught the plague from a lady whom he tried to cure, and died. A monument to his memory was placed in St. Paul's Cathedral, containing a well-deserved eulogy. To his efforts are due the improved system of prison accommodation and that discipline which seeks to reform the criminal, not only in Great Britain, but, to some extent, throughout a large part of Europe. Of the animating principle of his career, Dr. Stoughton has said that "religious principle developed in simple and unostentatious, almost puritanical, forms, constituted the strength and inspiration of Howard's world-known character." Mr. Howard's Life has been written by Aikin (London, 1792), Brown (London, 1818), Herworth Dixon (London, 5th ed., 1835), Taylor (London, 1836), John Field (London, 1850), Stoughton (London, 1853), and his Correspondence edited by Field (London, 1856).

Howe, John, an eminent Puritan divine and author; b. May 17, 1630, at Loughborough, Leicestershire, where his father was minister; d. April 2, 1706, in London. The elder Howe was thrust out of his position by Laud for espousing the cause of the Puritans, and went to Ireland when the subject of this sketch was five years old. He afterwards returned to England, and settled in Lancaster. John Howe was educated at Cambridge and Oxford, and made fellow of Magdalen College in the latter university, of which Dr. Thomas Goodwin was at the time the president. About 1652 he became pastor at Great Torrington in Devonshire. In this place, according to his own statement, the order of his services on fast-days was as follows: Beginning at nine in the morning, he made an invocation a quarter of an hour in length, spent three-quarters of an hour in expounding a chapter, prayed for an hour, preached for an hour, then prayed again for half an hour. Here followed a recess, in which Mr. Howe took some refreshment. Returning in a quarter of an hour (the people singing all the while), the services were resumed with a prayer of an hour, continued with a sermon of another hour, and concluded at four in the afternoon with a final prayer "of about a half an hour or more." Mr. Howe was a successful pastor; but his biographer, Edmund Calamy, without doubt has the sympathy of the present age when he closes this description by exclaiming, "A sort of service that few could have gone through without inexpressible weariness, both to themselves and their auditories."

In 1654 Howe went on a visit to London, and was an auditor in the chapel at Whitehall, when he was espièd, and recognized from his garb, by Cromwell, to be a country minister. Attracted by his fine appearance, the Protector despatched a messenger after him at the conclusion of the services, and pressed him so hard to remain over the following Sabbath and preach before him, that in vain he pleaded one excuse after another. The result was that Howe, much against his private preferences, became one of Cromwell's chaplains. Elevated to this position, he showed a tolerant spirit, and helped more than one of the Episcopalian clergymen, as, notably, Thomas Miller and Dr. Ward, afterwards Bishop of Exeter. Upon Richard's deposition, he returned to his former parish at Torrington. When the Act of Uniformity was passed, he quitted his church, but continued for some time in the neighborhood, preaching in private houses. In this he was called to Exeter to see the bishop, who proposed to him to be re-ordained. Howe answered, "The thought is shocking, my lord: it hurts my
understanding. It is an absurdity, for nothing can have two beginnings. I am sure I am a minister of Christ. and I can't begin again to be a minister." In common with Dr. Bates and others, he accepted the Five-Mile Act, which was passed in 1663, with the limiting clause, "so far as the laws of man are agreeable to the Word of God." In 1665, on account of the greater severity shown to the dissenters, he accepted an invitation to accompany Lord Wharton to the Continent. Between these times he was several times approached by persons high in office, in the hope that he might be led to conform. In 1665, on account of the greater severity shown to the dissenters, he accepted an invitation to accompany Lord Wharton to the Continent, and the year following settled at Utrecht. When James II. issued his declaration for liberty of conscience (in 1687), Howe returned to his old position in London. From this time till his death, he took an active interest in the theological discussions of the day (as that on the Trinity), and the Old Catholic movement. His principal writings are Philosophie der Kirchenwaltung (München, 1559, put on the Index in 1680), Johann Scults Erigena (1589), Das Papstthum u. d. Staat (1570), Geschicht des Jesuitenordens (1578). He also took part in the composition of Janus (1869), and wrote Quirinus (1870). See his Life by Zirngeb. München, 1881.

HUBER, Johannes Nepomuk, b. in Munich, Aug. 18, 1830; d. there, March 20, 1879. He was extraordinary professor of philosophy (1859), and ordinary professor (1864), in the university of Munich, one of the most fearless opponents of Ultramontanism, and later a leader in the Old Catholic movement. His principal writings are Philosophie der Kirchenwaltung (München, 1559, put on the Index in 1680), Johann Scults Erigena (1589), Das Papstthum u. d. Staat (1570), Geschicht des Jesuitenordens (1578). He also took part in the composition of Janus (1869), and wrote Quirinus (1870). See his Life by Zirngeb. München, 1881.

HUBER, Samuel, b. at Burgdorf, near Berne, 1547; d. at Osterwiek, in Hanover, March 23, 1624; studied theology, and was appointed pastor of his native parish. He inclined very strongly toward Lutheranism; and, being of a very combustive temperament, he caught at every opportunity of attacking Beza, Musculus, and the other leaders of the Reformed Church, especially on the question of predestination. The result was, that he was deposed from his office, and banished from the country, June 28, 1588. At Tübingen, whither he repaired, he openly embraced Lutheranism; and in 1592 he was made professor of theology at Wittenberg. But there, too, he fell out with his colleagues. He would make no distinction between diletto and electo, but taught a universalism which scandalized the Lutherans. Jan. 18, 1605, he was once more deposed, and banished from the country. The rest of his life he spent wandering from place to place, in very depressed circumstances. A complete list of his works, among which his Anti-Bellarminus (1607) occupies the principal place, is found in J. A. Schmid: Dissert. de S. H. Huber, Tübingen, 1757; also Acta Huberiana, Tübingen, 1597, and Acta Huberiana, ed. Götze, Lubeck, 1707.

HUBERINUS, Caspar, b. at Wilsbach, Bavaria, Dec. 21, 1500; d. at Oehringen, Oct. 6, 1553; was a monk, when in 1525 he began to preach the Reformers in Augsburg, and became an evangelical pastor there in 1528, and in 1544 superintendent at Oehringen. He published several collections of sermons.

HUBERT, St., son of Bertrand, Duke of Gui-
en, and a passionate hunter; was converted by meeting a stag which bore a cross between his antlers, and became bishop of Liége in 1508. He died in 1510, and his remains were afterwards deposited in the monastery of Audon, which bears his name. See GRANGES: Vie de saint Hubert, Moulins, 1873.

HÜBMAIER, or, as he used to write the name himself, HÜMBÖR, Balthasar, b. at Friedberg, near Augsburg, 1489; d. in Vienna (buried at the stake) March 10, 1528; studied theology and philosophy at Freiburg under Eck, and was appointed professor of theology at Ingolstadt in 1512, and preacher at the cathedral of Ratisbon in 1510. From the latter position he was removed in 1522, suspected of favoring the Reformation; and, as soon as he had become settled as preacher of Waldshut, he entered into communication with Zwingli, and openly embraced the reformed faith. At the same time he made the acquaintance of Th. Münzer; and when, in 1525, he published his Von dem christlichen Tausch der Glaubigen, it became apparent that he had adopted the Anabaptist views. Hiibmaier was dragged to Vienna, and executed. Calvary, in his Mitt. aus dem Antiquarische (vol. i., Berlin, 1870), gives a picture of the man and a complete list of his works. CUNITZ.

HUC, Evariste Régis, b. at Toulouse, Aug. 1, 1813; d. in Paris, March 31, 1860; entered the Congregation of St. Lazarus, and went in 1839 to China as a missionary. In 1849 he returned, and published Voyage dans la Tartarie, le Tibet et la Chine (Paris, 1850; translated into English, London, 1851, New York, 1853), L'Empire Chinois (Paris, 1854; translated into English, New York, 1855), and Le Christianisme en Chine, en Tartarie, et au Tibet (Paris, 1857).

HUCARIUS. See CANON LAW.

HUCBALD, b. in the middle of the ninth century; d. 930; was director first of the cloister-school of St. Amand in Flanders, then of the cathedral-school of Rheims. He wrote two treatises on music, which occupy a prominent place in the history of music, some biographies of saints, which are of historical value, and a poem. See G. NISARD: Hucbald, Paris, 1867.

Huet, François, b. at Villeau, in the department of Eure-et-Loir, Dec. 20, 1814; d. in Paris, July 1, 1889; was for several years professor of philosophy at Ghent, but lost that position by the persecutions of the Ultramontanists; became tutor to Prince Milan of Servia, and published Recherches sur la vie et les ouvrages d'Henri de Goul, 1838; Le Cartésisme, 1843, 2 vols.; Le romantisme, 1846; translated with notes by Moses Stuart, Andover, 1839. In this work he advocates the theory, that up to the middle of the third century the New-Testament text existed only in a common edition (codex eucharcl), which was subsequently revised by Hyæchins, Lucian of Antioch, and by Origen. (See the discussion of this theory by Tregelles, in Horne's Introduction, 14th ed., vol. iv., pp. 78-87, and by Scrivener, Introduction, 2d ed., pp. 468-460.) Among other noteworthy writings by Hug is his new interpretation of the Canticles, given in Das hohe Lied in einer noch unversuchten Deutung (Freiburg, 1819) and Schutzschrift für seine Deutung des hohen Liedes und derselben weitere Erklärung (Freiburg, 1818). According to him, the bride is of the kingdom of the ten tribes; the bridegroom is King Hezekiah; the brothers of Shulamith are a party in the house of Judah; the whole is "a representation, clothed in idyllic form, of the longing felt by the kingdom of the ten tribes for re-union with Judah, but which those 'brothers' opposed." (See Zöckler, in Lange's Commentary, American edition, Introduction to the Song of Solomon, p. 32.) For a full account of Hug, see Ad. MAIER: Gedächtnissrede auf Hug, Freiburg, 1847.

HUGHES, John, first archbishop of New York; b. at Annaloughan, Ireland, June 24, 1797; d. in New-York City, Jan. 3, 1864. He emigrated in 1817; entered the Mount St. Mary's Catholic College at Emmitsburg, Frederick County, Md., 1820; ordained priest 1826, and settled in Philadelphia, where he remained until 1827. In 1828 he was appointed co-adjutor bishop of New York, and consecrated Jan. 7, 1838. In 1842, on the death of Bishop Dubois, he became titular bishop; in 1850 the see of New York was raised to metropolitan rank, and he went to Rome to receive the pallium at the hands of the Pope. In 1847 he delivered before both houses of Congress, and at
HUGO OF ST. VICTOR.

1030

Hugh of St. Victor, a discourse upon Christianity, the only source of political, social, and political regeneration.

On Aug. 5, 1855, he laid the cornerstone of the cathedral on Fifth Avenue, which was dedicated May 25, 1879. In November, 1861, in company with Mr. Thurlow Weed, he made a semi-official journey to Europe, at the request of Secretary Seward, in order to secure the friendly neutrality of Europe, especially of France. In July, 1863, he addressed, as he supposed, the rioters, from the balcony of his house, Madison Avenue, corner 36th Street; but the great crowd which had collected, although Roman Catholic and Irish, was probably not riotous. Bishop Hughes played a more prominent part in America than any other Roman Catholic of his day, and enjoyed a great deal of general respect and popularity. He was, however, a determined Romanist, bent upon securing the destruction of the public schools and the support by the public money of Roman Catholic schools, but he disliked the idea of getting no compensation. Whether they had occasion or not, see Quétif et Échard: Scriptores ordinis predicantium, I. 194 sq.

C. SCHMIDT.

HUGO OF ST. VICTOR, with his contemporaries Abelard and Bernard, one of the most influential theologians of the twelfth century; was b. about 1087; d. Feb. 11, 1141. He gave himself up to a contemplative conventual life, and shone in consequence of pious and speculative thought, rather than of active participation in the ecclesiastical affairs of his day. He must be regarded as the real founder of the medieval mysticism of France, for Bernard of Clairvaux is dependent upon him for the essential features of his mystical speculations. The same may be affirmed of Peter Lombard. After-generations gave him the title of Didascalus (“teacher”), or Alter Augustinus (“the second Augustine”). Two localities claim the honor of being Hugo’s birthplace,—the vicinities of Ypres in Flanders, and Saxony. The Benedictines, in vol. xii. of the Hist. litur. de la France, bring forward three testimonies from old authors in favor of the former. But there are weightier testimonies for Saxony. His tombstone declared Hugo to be of Saxon birth (origine Saxo). This view was confirmed by Seeley’s Memoir, his Leifthild, London, 1834, and Bible Societies, p. 260.

Hugo of Amiens, b. at Amiens, towards the close of the eleventh century; d. at Rouen, Nov. 11, 1164; entered the monastery of Cluny in 1113; was elected Archbishop of Rouen in 1129; took a prominent part in political and ecclesiastical life, and wrote Dialogi Theologici (printed in Martene, T hesaurus, vol. ii.), and Contra Haereticos, printed as an appendix to the works of Guibert de Nogent, in the edition of D’Achery.

Hugh of Lincoln, b. about 1135, at Avon, Burgundy; d. in London, Nov. 19, 1200; entered the monastery of the Grande Chartreuse; was afterwards invited to England by Henry II. to establish the first Cistercian monastery in England, at Witham, and was made Archbishop of Lincoln in 1180. He was canonized about twenty years after his death. See Perry: Life of St. Hugh of Avalon, 1879.

Hugo of St. Cher (De Sancto Caro), also called Hugo de St. Theodoricus, was b. at St. Cher, a suburb of Viennos in Dauphine; studied theology and canon law in Paris; entered the Dominican order in 1224; was made a cardinal by Innocent IV. in 1245; and d. at Orvieto in 1263. He was a learned man, took an active part in the controversy between William of St. Amour and the mendicant orders, and was a member of the committee formed to examine the Introductorius in Evangelium externum by Gerhard. His own works, however, are those of a collector rather than the mind of a theologian. His auctore universa Biblia gives short explanations—literal, allegorical, mystical, and moral—of the single words, and contains many curious things. But his Sacrarum Bibliorum Concordantiae, also called Concordantiae S. Jacobi (because he was aided by monks from the Dominican monastery of St. Jacob), or Concordantiae Anglicanae (because the quotations were afterwards written out by English monks residing in Paris), became the model for all following works of the kind. Many works bearing his name are still extant in manuscript, but it is doubtful whether they belong to him. See Quétif et Échard: Scriptores ordinis predicatorum, I. 194 sq.
The two other works of the last period (the Summa Sententiarum and the De Sacramentis Christ. Fidel.) give the outline of Hugo's theological views, and his relation to Abelard, to whom, and Anselm, he is under obligations for some of his speculations. The works of God he treats under Works of Creation, and Works of Restoration. He discusses the Trinity and the three fundamental divine attributes—power, wisdom, and love. In the treatment of the origin of evil, he is far from the superfluous subtleties of the scholastics of a later period. Original sin he agreeis with Melanchthon, to consist in ignorance and concupiscence. He mentions five sacraments,—baptism, the Eucharist, confirmation, extreme unction, and marriage. They confer grace. In the three sections on eschatology he commends prayers to the saints.

HUGUENOTS. A designation given to the Reformed, or Calvinists, of France. The origin of the word is involved in great obscurity. The French Protestants received at different times a variety of names, applied, for the most part, in derision; such as Lutherans, Sacramentarians, Christaudins, Parpaillots, "those of the pretended reformed religion," or simply "those of the religion," "religionnaires," etc. It was not until the time of the Tumult of Amboise, 1560, that the term "Huguenot" came into general use. Among the many explanations of the word that have been offered, only three need be mentioned. It has been derived from the German Eidgenossen ("confederates"),—a designation borne by the patriotic party in Geneva a quarter of a century earlier. This view was naturally a favorite one with those writers who represented the Huguenots as secret conspirators against the crown. Against it may be urged the difficulty of accounting for the transfer of the name from Geneva to the Valley of the Loire, the length of time that elapsed before the alleged re-appearance of the word, and the preference given by Beza, in the history written by him or under his supervision, in Geneva, for another derivation. Less plausible is the explanation offered by some of the Reformers themselves, who maintained that they were called Huguenots because they zealously advocated the cause of the descendants of Hugh Capet. They have '
the seeds of truth they had scattered lost none of their vitality.

At first, under the influence of his sister, the cultivated Margaret, Duchess of Angoulême, Francis I. showed a disposition to favor the fatal tournament. This arose, however, rather from a taste for learning, and ambition to earn distinction as a patron of the revival of letters, than from any hearty sympathy with the doctrinal views of the reformers. Moreover, the immense ecclesiastical patronage which he secured by means of the concordat entered into with Leo X., made it important to his material interests that he should remain on good terms with the Papacy. The active participation of Francis I. in the persecution of the Protestants dates from the “affair of the placards” (1534), when a violent handbill against the papal mass was found posted upon the door of the king’s bed-chamber in the Castle of Amboise. In connection with the great expiatory procession, soon after instituted (January, 1535), six Protestants were burned alive before the king’s eyes, and Francis declared his purpose to extirpate heresy from his dominions. He would, he said, cut off his own arm were it infected with this poison.

The executions that followed for some months were the first serious attempt at persecution; although some distinguished victims, such as the learned and noble Louis de Berquin, had suffered earlier. Legislation became more systematically severe. In 1535 took place the Massacre of Mérindol and Cabrières. Twenty-two towns and villages on the River Durance, inhabited by French Waldenses of the same stock with the Waldenses of Piedmont, were destroyed by an armed expedition fitted out at Aix with the sanction of the Parliament of Provence. The next year witnessed the martyrdom of the “Fourteen of Meaux.”

During the reign of Henry II., the bigoted and licentious son of Francis (1547-59), Protestantism grew steadily, despite the most earnest attempts to destroy it. The centre of the reformatory movement was Geneva, whence John Calvin exerted, by means of his books and his immense correspondence, as well as indirectly through his former pupils, an influence that was almost incredible. Stringent laws against the importation of any books or papers were issued, but without result. In 1555 an attempt to introduce the Spanish Inquisition failed in consequence of the enlightened and determined resistance of the Parliament of Paris, with President Séguier at its head. In the same year an expedition, under the patronage of Admiral Coligny, set sail for Brazil, where it was hoped that a home for the persecuted might be found; but the scheme failed through the treachery of Villegagnon.

The Protestants increased greatly in numbers during the last years of Henry’s life. Of this fact a proof was given in the public psalm-singing by great crowds in Paris itself. One of the chief motives of the king in concluding a disgraceful peace with Spain was avowedly to secure the right of the Protestants to meet for worship, without arms, in all places outside of the walled towns.
The Edict of January was the Magna Charta of Huguenot rights. Its violation was the fruitful source of a long period of civil commotion: for a whole generation the exertions of the Huguenots were directed almost solely to the maintenance or recovery of its provisions.

II. THE CIVIL WARS UNDER CHARLES IX., AND THE EDICT OF ST. Bartholomew's DAY (1562-74). Scarcely had the edict been signed, when the unprovoked Massacre of Vassy, perpetrated by the Duke of Guise upon an assembly of Protestant worshippers, gave the signal for the first civil war (1562-63). Admiral Coligny and the Prince of Condé were the Huguenot leaders: Constable Montmorency, the Duke of Guise, and Marshal Saint André were the principal Roman-Catholic generals. The war raged over a great part of France, with various successes on both sides. Both Montmorency and Condé were taken prisoners; and St. André was killed at the battle of Dreux, where the Huguenots met with defeat. The murder of Duke Francis of Guise, by a fanatic named Poltrot, was closely followed by the conclusion of the Peace of Amboise. Instead of unrestricted worship outside of town-walls throughout France, the Huguenots were now allowed to meet in the suburbs of a single town in every bailiwick, and in certain cities that remained in their possession at the conclusion of the peace. A few noblemen had the right to have service in their own castles.

In 1565 the Conference of Bayonne was held between Catherine de’ Medici, and the king her son, on the one side, and the Duke of Alva on the other. At this meeting it has been generally, but erroneously, supposed that the plan of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew’s Day, executed seven years later, was traced or even agreed upon. A second civil war (1566-68) soon broke out, but it was of short duration. The third civil war (1568-70) was a more sanguinary struggle. The Huguenots were defeated in the two pitched battles of Jarnac and Moncontour, in the former of which, Louis, Prince of Condé, was killed. But the admirable generalship of Coligny not only saved the Huguenots from destruction, but enabled them to secure favorable terms of peace.

Two years of quiet followed, and there seemed to be a fair prospect that the wounds inflicted by the internecine contest might soon heal. Henry, King of Navarre, was married to Margaret of Valois, youngest sister of Charles IX. In the midst of the festivities attending the occasion, Coligny was wounded by an assassin. This event was followed within forty-eight hours by the Massacre of St. Bartholomew’s Day (Sunday, Aug. 24, 1572). By this blow the attempt was made to annihilate the Huguenots, whom their enemies had thought in no position for an honorable combat. Coligny and many of the most distinguished leaders, together with multitudes of their brethren in the faith, were mercilessly butchered. The number of victims in Paris and throughout the rest of the kingdom has been estimated variously at from twenty thousand to one hundred thousand. (See BARTHOLOMEW’S DAY, Massacre of St.)

The Huguenots were not, however, exterminated. In a fourth war (1572-73) they not only defended La Rochelle with success against the king, but obtained honorable terms of peace.

III. THE STRUGGLE TO SECURE FULL TOLERATION, IN THE REIGNS OF HENRY III. AND HENRY IV., TO THE EDICT OF NANTES (1574-98). — A fifth civil war, begun a few weeks before the accession of Henry III., lasted until the new king became convinced that it was useless attempting to reduce his Protestant subjects, as they were by a strong German auxiliary army. The peace now conceded, commonly known as “La Paix de Monsieur” (Edict of Beau- lieu, May, 1576), was ostensibly more advantageous than any previously granted to the Huguenots; since it authorized the celebration of their worship everywhere in France outside of Paris, without exception as to time or place, unless the nobleman upon whose lands it was proposed to hold it objected.

The very liberality of the new pacification led to its speedy overthrow. At the instigation of the Roman-Catholic clergy and of the Guises, the Holy and Christian League sprang up in various parts of France, having for its avowed object the extirpation of heresy. At the meeting of the States-General at Blois, the king was induced to proclaim himself head of the league. Hence arose the sixth civil war, which lasted only a few months, since the king found the states unwilling to supply him the means of carrying on hostilities. The new peace (Edict of Poitiers, September, 1577) re-introduced discriminations as to the cities wherein Protestant worship might be held, and the noblemen entitled to have services in their castles. As in the previous peace, eight cities were placed in Protestant hands as pledges of its faithful execution, and mixed courts were instituted to adjudicate cases in which the parties belonged to different religions.

For eight years, with the exception of a few months covered by the unimportant seventh civil war, otherwise known as “La Guerre des Amou- reux” (1580), the peace was unbroken; although there was no lack of surprises of cities and other infractions of the treaty.

In 1584 the king's only brother died. As Henry III. was childless, Henry of Bourbon, the Huguenot King of Navarre, became heir to the throne of France. The prospect that a “heretic” might succeed gave new life to the league. The Guises, with the support of Philip II., made war upon Henry III., and after a struggle, in which the Huguenots took no part, compelled the reluctant monarch to proscribe the Protestant religion by the Edict of Nemours (July, 1586).

The eighth civil war followed (1585-89). The most noted action was the battle of Coutras (1587), in which the Roman Catholics, under the Duke of Joyeuse, were defeated by the Huguenot troops of Henry of Navarre; the duke himself being killed in the engagement. This was the first pitched battle ever won by the Huguenots; and it made so deep an impression upon their enemies, that the very sight of the Protestant soldiers kneeling before joining battle, as they had done at Coutras, struck terror into the hearts of the Roman-Catholic soldiers of engagements. The murder of Henry, Duke of Guise, and of his brother, the Cardinal of Guise, at the second States of Blois (December, 1585),
was followed, a few months subsequently, by a truce between Henry III. and Henry of Navarre. The assassination of Henry III. (August, 1589) brought Henry of Navarre, a Protestant prince, to the throne of France, under the title of Henry IV. In the wars in which this king was engaged for years against the League, backed by the money and troops of Philip II., he enjoyed the hearty support of the Huguenots. After his insincere abjuration in 1593 (see Henry IV.), their position was in some respects less favorable than it had been under the Valois kings; since they had lost their nominal leader and the ”protector“ of their churches. After a long and vexatious delay, the king fulfilled his promise, and undertook to determine the civil status of the Protestants by a law which was declared to be ”perpetual and irrevocable.” The Edict of Nantes (April, 1598) secured freedom of conscience throughout the kingdom, and recognized the right of the Protestants to meet for worship on the lands of noble seigniors, and in places where Protestant worship had been conceded by the edict of 1577 and subsequent interpretative declarations. These and other concessions respecting the admission of the Reformed to civil offices, and to universities and schools, on equal terms with the Roman Catholics, the establishment of mixed courts, etc., made the edict the most important bulwark of Protestant rights.

IV. THE PERIOD FROM THE PUBLICATION TO THE REVOCATION OF THE EDICT OF NANTES (1598–1685).—The edict of Henry IV. was, after his assassination (1610), solemnly confirmed by the successive declarations of the regents, Marie de Medici, of Louis XIII. and Louis XIV. None of the less had the Huguenots soon reason to complain of infractions of a vexatious character, for which no satisfaction could be obtained. The ruin of the Protestant churches of Bearn (1620), which Louis XIII. proceeded in person, and recently re-established the supremacy of the Roman-Catholic hierarchy, led to a Huguenot uprising. This was of brief duration; but in 1625 hostilities were renewed. The Protestants being no match for the forces of the king, the fall of La Rochelle (1628), after a vigorous siege conducted by Cardinal Richelieu, marked the close of the war and the end of the political importance of the Huguenots as a power in the State.

Meantime never were the Huguenots intellectually more active. Their worship in the neighborhood of Paris, after having been fixed at the village of Ablon, a spot both distant, and difficult of access (see Ablon), had been brought to the nearer and more convenient Charenton. This place became the centre of a powerful religious and philosophical influence that made itself felt in the capital of the kingdom and at the royal court. The number of eminent writers and preachers was great. In different parts of the kingdom, not less than six theological seminaries, or ”académies,” had been instituted, of which those of Saumur, Montauban, and Sedan, were the most important.

Although the violations of the spirit and even the letter of the Edict of Nantes had been frequent, it was not until after the death of Cardinal Mazarin (1661), that the process of restriction, whose logical conclusion could only be the complete repeal of Henry IV.”s ordinance, may be said distinctly to have been undertaken. From this time forward, the Huguenots, although they had been highly praised by the monarch himself more than once for their loyalty to the crown at the time of the troubles of the “Fronde,” were allowed little rest. Vexatious regulations successively deprived them of their places of worship, excluded them from one employment after another, and, under the forms of law, robbed them of their property, and even the possession of their children. As the time for the last act approached, the terrible “dragonnades” were set on foot to compel the abjuration of those whose constancy rational persuasion had been powerless to shake. At length (October, 1685), on the pretense that his measures had proved successful, and that the reformed religion no longer existed in his dominions, Louis XIV. signed the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. No exercise of the Protestant religion was to be tolerated in France. All ministers of the gospel were to be driven out of the kingdom within a fortnight. No other persons could emigrate, under penalty of the galleys for men, of imprisonment and confiscation of property for women. More cruel than the infamous “League” itself, the Edict of Revocation shut up the French Protestants as in a prison, punishing inexorably all attempts at escape.

V. FROM THE REVOCATION TO THE EDICT OF TOLERATION (1685–1787).—In spite of the prohibition contained in the Edict of Revocation, the immediate effect was a great increase in the number of French Protestants that fled into foreign lands. The total number cannot be definitely ascertained. It has been estimated as high as eight hundred thousand; but this figure is undoubtedly excessive, the number probably not being over three hundred thousand to four hundred thousand. The exodus included the most industrious and thrifty part of the population. For a hundred years the Protestants that remained in France enjoyed only such rare and precarious means of edification as were afforded by the so-called ”Assemblies of the Desert,”—meetings in secluded spots remote from the towns, or in the bleak region of the Cevennes Mountains. Attendance on these gatherings was a grave offence; and the venturesome minister incurred, if apprehended, the punishment of being broken upon the wheel. So late as Feb. 19, 1762, a minister named Rochette was beheaded, by authority of the Parliament of Toulouse, for the sole crime of having preached, performed marriages, and administered the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord’s Supper. In 1767, for the same offence, another minister, Berenger, was condemned to death, and executed in effigy.

The episode of the war of the Camisards, which lasted from 1702–5, has been treated elsewhere. (See CAMISARDS.) At length, yielding to the force of public opinion, Louis XVI. published (November, 1787) the Edict of Tolerance. This document still declared that “the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion alone shall continue to enjoy public worship.” But it authorized the registry of Protestant births, marriages, and deaths, and forbade
that the Protestants should in any way be disturbed because of their faith.

The National Assembly, in 1790, took steps for the restoration of the confiscated property of Protestant refugees. The law of the eighteenth Germinal Year X. (1802) organized the Reformed and Lutheran churches, whose pastors were henceforth paid by the State.

Protestant refugees. The Huguenots, driven from France by persecution, were welcomed by all the countries to which they turned their steps. All the Protestant lands of Europe were glad to enrich their trade and manufactures by the accession of the most intelligent and industrious class of the French population. The very name “Huguenot,” having acquired an honorable association, became a passport to favor.

Switzerland, “destined by Providence to be a land of refuge,” had been the resort of persecuted Frenchmen from the beginning of the Reformation. The Huguenot fugitives increased greatly after the Massacre of St. Bartholomew’s Day; while the persecution culminating in the Revocation brought in so large a number, that the resources of the hospitable cantons were taxed to the utmost to provide for their sustenance. Many of the fugitives from the earlier persecutions returned to France when the storm had partially spent its fury: others, particularly after the Revocation, made Switzerland only the first stage in their retreat. These passed on, after a time, to Wurttemberg, Hesse, Brandenburg, and other parts of Germany, whose rulers saw in the Huguenot peasants and artisans the very persons whom they needed for the regions depopulated by the Thirty Years’ War.

In the very month in which Louis XIV. signed at Fontainebleau the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the elector, Frederick William of Brandenburg, signed at Potsdam an edict by which not only was warm sympathy expressed, but great inducements were held forth to all Huguenots that might desire to settle in his dominions. Provision was made both for the safety and for the expenses of the refugees in reaching their destination. Despite strenuous efforts on the part of the French Government to suppress or discredit it, copies of the Potsdam edict were circulated in every part of France, and crowds of Huguenots found their way to Frankfort-on-the-Main. Here they were met by agents of the elector, and were generously helped on their way. An important French colony sprang up in Berlin, which still maintains a distinctive existence. Many families of Huguenot origin have, however, become thoroughly German in character, even the names having been translated or modified to suit the German ear. It has been remarked, that, in the Franco-German war of 1870-71, many of the officers of the victorious army of invasion were descendants of those whom the intolerant policy of Louis XIV. compelled to expatriate themselves.

In Holland the Huguenot refugees were treated with great kindness. Not only was a public fast instituted when the tidings of the Revocation came, but valuable political concessions were made. The credit of the refugees was recognized, a freedom of the city, and exemption from import duties for twelve years. Middleburg in Zealand relieved them of the burden of taxation for ten years. General collections were made for their relief, in which Lutherans, Anabaptists, and even Roman Catholics, took part. The exiled pastors, two hundred and fifty in number, were specially cared for. Military men secured positions in the army, with ample pay, and promise of promotion. But all the fugitives were not poor. Some brought to their adopted country large fortunes; for as early as the last months of 1685 it was reported that twenty million livres had been carried out of France by those who were regarded as among the wealthiest merchants of the land. Holland was greatly enriched intellectually, as well as in a material point of view. Batavia, Benoît, DuBose, and Martin were among the scholars she gained from France. The refugees settling on Dutch soil alone were estimated by Caveyrae at fifty-five thousand, and another Roman-Catholic source places them at seventy-five thousand, in the first year after the Revocation. In 1708, the same year that Queen Anne gave letters of naturalization to all the refugees in England, the States of Holland and West Friesland took the same step. Other provinces followed the example, and in 1715 the States-General extended the same blessing to all the republic.

Northern Europe opened its doors to the fugitives. Despite the strong Lutheran sentiments of Denmark, the king, on hearing of the cruel dragonnades, in 1681 published a declaration offering the French refugees an asylum, the right to build churches, exemption from taxation for eight years, etc. In 1685 a new edict conferred upon French noble refugees the same distinctions that they had enjoyed at home, to officers a corresponding rank, and great inducements to manufacturers. Several flourishing colonies were established at different points. Sweden was less hospitable; but in Russia a ukase, signed by Peter and Ivan (1688), opened to the refugees all the provinces of the empire, and gave to officers employment in the army. Voltaire maintains that one-third of the regiment of twelve thousand formed by the Genevese Lefort for Peter was composed of French refugees.

While all the countries mentioned received a great accession of wealth from the industries brought with them by the fugitive Huguenots, it was England that profited most by the ill-judged act of Louis XIV. From the time of the pious Edward VI., the monarchs of that country, with the single exception of Mary, had been their allies and protectors. The French Church of London owed its origin (1550) to the kind offices of the Duke of Somerset and Archbishop Cranmer. In 1561, under Queen Elizabeth, a French church was founded at Canterbury for the Walloons, meeting in the crypts of the cathedral, as it continues to do to the present day. In 1670 it had a membership of twenty-five hundred communicants. Soon after, the French refugees proper went off and formed a new church. Before the Revocation, there had also arisen French churches at Sandwich, Norwich, Southampton, Glastonbury, Rye, and six or seven other places; while the old French church at the capital had been re-enforced by the Savoy, Marylebone, and Castle-street churches.

On the outbreak of the dragonnades, Charles II. issued (July 28, 1681) the proclamation of
Hampton Court, welcoming the Huguenot refugees, issued letters of naturalization and privileges for carrying on trade and manufactures. After the Revocation, James II. extended to them a similar invitation. M. Weiss estimates the number of Huguenots that fled to England, during the decade in which the Revocation lasted, at eighty thousand persons, of whom about one-third settled in London. To the five earlier French churches of the metropolis there were added twenty-six new churches, almost all during the reigns of William and Mary, of Anne, and of George I. Eleven or twelve more sprang up in other parts of England. An order of council enjoined a general collection in favor of the refugees, from which a fund of about two hundred thousand pounds resulted. Nor were the services rendered by the Huguenots slight. In the army of William of Orange, when he marched against his father-in-law, there were three regiments of foot and a squadron of horse, composed exclusively of French Protestant refugees. To these troops, and to a strong element of French officers,—veterans of Condé and Turenne, seven hundred and thirty-six in number,—scattered throughout the rest of the army, the overthrow of the last Stuart king was in great part due. Schomberg, Ruvigny, and others distinguished themselves in the fresh warfare to which they were called, and both honored and benefited their adopted country. More important and lasting was the service done by the introduction of a number of new manufactures, until then but little known: silk, hats, and glass, were made on British soil. Silks and satins were produced north of the Channel such as had previously come only from the looms of Lyons: in a word, the manufactures of England were built up at the expense of France. Even in an intellectual point of view, the influence of the refugees was great. We need only mention the names of Denis Papin, the first investigator of the principles of steam, and Rapin-Thomas, whose History of England was without a rival until the publication of the work of David Hume. Although, with the lapse of time, the refugees have become thoroughly merged in the population of the United Kingdom, there remain many historic traces of interest; such as the Hospital for Poor French Protestants and their Descendants residing in Great Britain, whose new and elegant building attracts the eye of the visitor.

The Huguenots in the United States.—The unfortunate attempt at colonization in Brazil has already been referred to. Equally fruitless was the undertaking, under the patronage of Admiral Coligny, to found a French Protestant settlement in Florida (1562). Greater success attended the subsequent emigration of the Huguenots, which, if it did not lead to the acquisition by France of an American empire, added much to the prosperity of the English colonial system. The Dutch in America were the first to profit by it. Long before the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the stream of Huguenot emigration set in toward the New Netherlands. The first band of settlers sent over (1623) by the Dutch West India Company consisted of thirty families, chiefly Walloons. These were the founders of the city of New Amsterdarn (New York), where French was spoken, and the Huguenot faith was professed from the outset. Other Walloons and French settled at an early day on Long Island and Staten Island, and upon the banks of the Delaware, and in 1660 founded New Paltz on the Hudson. As the severities visited upon the Protestants in France increased, large numbers of refugees came to this country, establishing themselves in New York, in Boston, in Maryland, and Virginia, and in Charles- ton, S.C. Detachments from these bodies of immigrants settled in Oxford, Mass., Kingston, R.I., New Rochelle, N.Y., and on the Cooper and Sandy Rivers, South Carolina. In all these places churches were organized, and ministers of the French Reformed Church officiated. The French settlements in Oxford, Mass., and Kingston, R.I., were soon broken up: the others continued for several generations to maintain a distinct character. The French church in Boston lasted until the year 1748, when its pastors, Pierre Daillé (1698-1718) and André Le Mercier (1718-45), The French congregation in New York, long flourishing and influential, had a succession of Reformed pastors, the last of whom submitted to Episcopal ordination in 1806, when the church adopted the Episcopal rite, and took the name of "L'Eglise du Saint Esprit." In New Rochelle, N.Y., two churches were maintained almost until the outbreak of the American Revolution,—the French Reformed Church, founded in 1688, and a French Episcopal Church, organized in 1798. In total, the French language superseded the French in public worship about the year 1735. Three of the four Huguenot congregations of South Carolina went out of existence, or became merged with neighboring English-speaking churches: the French church in Charleston alone survives to the present day, and uses an excellent liturgy.

No precise statement can be ventured as to the numbers of Huguenots that came to America; but it is certain that they must have reached several thousands. The influence of this element is felt in the language, in the literature, and in the institutions of the United States, a noticeable and significant fact.

Sources.—Theodore de Bèze: Histoire ecclés. des églises reformées de France, Antwerp, 1580 (a very correct re-impression, with notes, Toulouse, 1852, 2 vols.). It covers the period from 1317 to 1583. Jean de Serres: Commentarii de statu, et memoria e religiosis et republicis in Gallo, Geneva, 1570-80, 5 vols., each containing 3 books. This very accurate history covers the years 1557-76. [Simon Goulard, or Jean de Serres]: Recueil des choses memorables avenues en France sous le règne de Henri II., Francois II., Charles IX., Henri III., et Henri IV. (known also as Histoire des cinq rois), Dort, 1598. Covers the years 1547-90. F. de la Place, Commentaires de l'état de la rel. et repub., and Regnier de la Planché, Hist. de l'état de France (both republished in Panthéon Littéraire). The former covers the years 1558-61; the latter, 1568-60. Theodore A. Chirico d'Aubigné: Histoire universelle, Malé, 1918-50,

HUISSEAU, Isaac d', b. in Paris towards the close of the 16th and in the first part of the 17th century, is known as a learned and pious writer. He was a member of the Society of Jesus and after the revolution of the Edict of Nantes studied at Sedan, and became pastor of Saumur. He published La discipline des églises réformées de France (1650), which has run through many editions, and is still of great value; and La réunion du christianisme (1670), which was violently attacked by the rigid Calvinists.

HULSE, John, Rev., b. at Middlewich, Cheshire, Eng., 1708; d. there Dec. 14, 1790. He was educated at Cambridge, and bequeathed all his property to that university for the purpose of establishing two scholarships, one for Protestant, and the other for Catholic students. He was the author of Christian Advocate and Christian Preacher, or Hulsean Lecturer. The latter's duties, according to Mr. Hulse's will, were to deliver and print twenty sermons yearly, either upon the evidences of Christianity, or upon the difficulties of the Bible. But several changes have been made in the execution of this will. The Hulsean professorship was by statute substituted in 1860 for the Christian advocacy; in 1830 the number of annual lecture-sermons was reduced to eight, and again, still later, to four; and of the annual revenue (between eight hundred and nine hundred pounds) eight-tenths goes to the Hulsean professor, and one-tenth to the Hulsean prize man and lecturer respectively. See, for list of lectures, the art. Lectures in the Appendix.

HULSEAN LECTURES. See Hulse, John.

HULSEMANN, Johann, b. in Ostfriesland, 1802; d. at Leipzig, 1861; was appointed professor of theology at Wittenberg, 1829, and at Leipzig, 1846. His principal works are Calvinismus irreconcilabilis, 1646, and Breviarium theologiae (which appeared in an enlarged form in 1655, — Extensio breviarii theologiae), and gives an interesting representation of orthodox Lutheran dogmatics.

HUMANIST, a term derived from the Cicero-nian expression littera humaniores, was adopted as a name in the sixteenth century, and probably not without a side-glance at such terms as scholasticism, scientia sacra, etc., by those who, in the field of literature proper, represented the powerful movement of the Renaissance. Bursting forth everywhere, this movement produced everywhere a revolution. A new poetry, a new art, new methods of science, new maxims of morals, new political tendencies, followed in its steps; but its influence was, perhaps, nowhere more strikingly apparent than in the sphere of belles-lettres.

The humanists were literati, not theologians; teachers, not priests. The task with which they originally started was simply to restore the Latin language. Under the hands of the Roman-Catholic Church, and treated as badly by the barbarian ignorance of the monks, the Latin language had become a thing unspeakable; and it was as much indignation at its pitiful state, as enthusiasm for its former glory, which fired the Italians to attempt its restoration. The attempt succeeded; but, though other and quite different tasks presented themselves, the humanists never lost the character of being the philologists, grammarians, exegetes, and critics of their age; and their best work lies in that line. They made the study of Greek an indispensable element of scholarly education; they introduced the study of Hebrew: yea, even the development of the barbarian ignorance of the monks, the Latin language had become a thing unspeakable; and it was as much indignation at its pitiful state, as enthusiasm for its former glory, which fired the Italians to attempt its restoration. The attempt succeeded; but, though other and quite different tasks presented themselves, the humanists never lost the character of being the philologists, grammarians, exegetes, and critics of their age; and their best work lies in that line. They made the study of Greek an indispensable element of scholarly education; they introduced the study of Hebrew: yea, even the development of the Latin language, which grew up which the barbarian ignorance of the monks, the Latin language had become a thing unspeakable; and it was as much indignation at its pitiful state, as enthusiasm for its former glory, which fired the Italians to attempt its restoration. The attempt succeeded; but, though other and quite different tasks presented themselves, the humanists never lost the character of being the philologists, grammarians, exegetes, and critics of their age; and their best work lies in that line. They made the study of Greek an indispensable element of scholarly education; they introduced the study of Hebrew: yea, even the development of the Latin language, which grew up with the barbarian ignorance of the monks, the Latin language had become a thing unspeakable; and it was as much indignation at its pitiful state, as enthusiasm for its former glory, which fired the Italians to attempt its restoration. The attempt succeeded; but, though other and quite different tasks presented themselves, the humanists never lost the character of being the philologists, grammarians, exegetes, and critics of their age; and their best work lies in that line. They made the study of Greek an indispensable element of scholarly education; they introduced the study of Hebrew: yea, even the development of the Latin language, which grew up with the barbarian ignorance of the monks, the Latin language had become a thing unspeakable; and it was as much indignation at its pitiful state, as enthusiasm for its former glory, which fired the Italians to attempt its restoration. The attempt succeeded; but, though other and quite different tasks presented themselves, the humanists never lost the character of being the philologists, grammarians, exegetes, and critics of their age; and their best work lies in that line. They made the study of Greek an indispensable element of scholarly education; they introduced the study of Hebrew: yea, even the development of the Latin language, which grew up with the barbarian ignorance of the monks, the Latin language had become a thing unspeakable; and it was as much indignation at its pitiful state, as enthusiasm for its former glory, which fired the Italians to attempt its restoration. The attempt succeeded; but, though other and quite different tasks presented themselves, the humanists never lost the character of being the philologists, grammarians, exegetes, and critics of their age; and their best work lies in that line. They made the study of Greek an indispensable element of scholarly education; they introduced the study of Hebrew: yea, even the development of the Latin language, which grew up with the barbarian ignorance of the monks, the Latin language had become a thing unspeakable; and it was as much indignation at its pitiful state, as enthusiasm for its former glory, which fired the Italians to attempt its restoration. The attempt succeeded; but, though other and quite different tasks presented themselves, the humanists never lost the character of being the philologists, grammarians, exegetes, and critics of their age; and their best work lies in that line. They made the study of Greek an indispensable element of scholarly education; they introduced the study of Hebrew: yea, even the development of the Latin language, which grew up with the barbarian ignorance of the monks, the Latin language had become a thing unspeakable; and it was as much indignation at its pitiful state, as enthusiasm for its former glory, which fired the Italians to attempt its restoration. The attempt succeeded; but, though other and quite different tasks presented themselves, the humanists never lost the character of being the philologists, grammarians, exegetes, and critics of their age; and their best work lies in that line. They made the study of Greek an indispensable element of scholarly education; they introduced the study of Hebrew: yea, even the development of the Latin language, which grew up with the barbarian ignorance of the monks, the Latin language had become a thing unspeakable; and it was as much indignation at its pitiful state, as enthusiasm for its former glory, which fired the Italians to attempt its restoration. The attempt succeeded; but, though other and quite different tasks presented themselves, the humanists never lost the character of being the philologists, grammarians, exegetes, and critics of their age; and their best work lies in that line. They made the study of Greek an indispensable element of scholarly education; they introduced the study of Hebrew: yea, even the development of the Latin language, which grew up with the barbarian ignorance of the monks, the Latin language had become a thing unspeakable; and it was as much indignation at its pitiful state, as enthusiasm for its former glory, which fired the Italians to attempt its restoration. The attempt succeeded; but, though other and quite different tasks presented themselves, the humanists never lost the character of being the philologists, grammarians, exegetes, and critics of their age; and their best work lies in that line. They made the study of Greek an indispensable element of scholarly education; they introduced the study of Hebrew: yea, even the development of the Latin language, which grew up
and the humanists, though it could not be long concealed that their greatest philological achievements—the Comptutianian polyglot, the printing of the Greek text of the New Testament, etc.—were seized upon by the adversaries of Rome, and used as weapons against her. But after the language followed the authors, and after the authors their ideas. Gradually the humanist grew from a philologist into a historian, and from an historian into a philosopher. He studied not only classical language and literature, but also classical life and spirit. He claimed to know what belongs to man by nature (his faculties and his failings) and what concerns man by nature (his rights and his duties). His criticism of words became criticism of facts; and Laurentius Valla laughed at the donation of Constantine. His knowledge of history became political demands, and, even with Melanchthon in full sight, it is safe to say that the humanists would never have made the Reformation.

Not to overrate, however, the influence which the humanists have exercised on the history of the Church, it must be noticed that though they furnished the Reformers with arms, and seemed personally very favorably disposed to the Reformation, only few of them actually took part in the work. Erasmus retreated before the task; and, even with Melanchthon in full sight, it is safe to say that the humanists would never have made the Reformation.


**HUMANITARIANS.** A name applied both to that school of Unitarians, or those anti-Trinitarians in general, who consider Christ a mere man (homo), and to such parties as profess the "religion of humanity," whose fundamental dogma is the spontaneous perfectibility of the human race without any superhuman aid. Hume, David, b. at Edinburgh, April 26, 1711; d. there Aug. 26, 1776. He was the son of a member of the Faculty of Advocates, who passed his life as a country gentleman at the family-seat of Ninewells in the border country of Scotland. He entered Edinburgh University before he was twenty years of age, and was introduced by his master beyond the powers of one so young. He tells us, "I was seized very early with a passion for literature, which has been the ruling passion of my life." We have admirable accounts of his life; the one, *My Own Life*, calm as philosophy itself; the other by Mr. Hill Burton, who had access to the papers collected by Baron Hume, and deposited with the Royal Society of Edinburgh. The latter has published a remarkable letter written to an eminent physician by the young man at the very crisis of his being. It appears, that, for a time, he labored to find security and peace in philosophy. "Having read many books of morality, such as Cicero, Seneca, and Plutarch, and being smitten with their beautiful representations of virtue and philosophy, I underwent the improvement of my temper and will, along with my reason and understanding. I was continually fortifying myself with reflections against death and poverty, and shame and pain, and all the other calamities of life." But in this attempt he utterly broke down.

Hating the study of law, to which he was destined by his friends, he was sent to Bristol to engage in business; but, finding the employment unsuitable to him, he went, at the age of twenty-three, to France, to engage in the observation of mankind and in the study of his favorite subjects. After living there for three years, he brought back with him his *Treatise of Human Nature*, the two first volumes of which were published in London in the end of 1738. "Never literary attempts may be made to sublimate the human mind, and in the study of his favorite subjects. After living there for three years, he brought back with him his *Treatise of Human Nature*. It fell dead-born from the press, without reaching such distinction as even to create a murmur among zealots." But with indomitable perseverance, which was one of his most marked characteristics, he persevered in his life-work. Next year he published the third volume of his treatise, that on ethics, with no better success. In 1748 he cast the first part of his unfortunate treatise in a new form, *Inquiry concerning Human Understanding*. He now broke down his great work into smaller essays, which must, in due time, be reprinted, and even with Melanchthon in full sight, it is safe to say that the humanists would never have made the Reformation. 

**HUMANISM.** The spontaneous perfectibility of the human race without any superhuman aid. Hume, David, b. at Edinburgh, April 26, 1711; d. there Aug. 26, 1776. He was the son of a member of the Faculty of Advocates, who passed his life as a country gentleman at the family-seat of Ninewells in the border country of Scotland. He entered Edinburgh University before he was twenty years of age, and was introduced by his master beyond the powers of one so young. He tells us, "I was seized very early with a passion for literature, which has been the ruling passion of my life." We have admirable accounts of his life; the one, *My Own Life*, calm as philosophy itself; the other by Mr. Hill Burton, who had access to the papers collected by Baron Hume, and deposited with the Royal Society of Edinburgh. The latter has published a remarkable letter written to an eminent physician by the young man at the very crisis of his being. It appears, that, for a time, he labored to find security and peace in philosophy. "Having read many books of morality, such as Cicero, Seneca, and Plutarch, and being smitten with their beautiful representations of virtue and philosophy, I underwent the improvement of my temper and will, along with my reason and understanding. I was continually fortifying myself with reflections against death and poverty, and shame and pain, and all the other calamities of life." But in this attempt he utterly broke down.

Hating the study of law, to which he was destined by his friends, he was sent to Bristol to engage in business; but, finding the employment unsuitable to him, he went, at the age of twenty-three, to France, to engage in the observation of mankind and in the study of his favorite subjects. After living there for three years, he brought back with him his *Treatise of Human Nature*, the two first volumes of which were published in London in the end of 1738. "Never literary attempts may be made to sublimate the human mind, and in the study of his favorite subjects. After living there for three years, he brought back with him his *Treatise of Human Nature*. It fell dead-born from the press, without reaching such distinction as even to create a murmur among zealots." But with indomitable perseverance, which was one of his most marked characteristics, he persevered in his life-work. Next year he published the third volume of his treatise, that on ethics, with no better success. In 1748 he cast the first part of his unfortunate treatise in a new form, *Inquiry concerning Human Understanding*. He now broke down his great work into smaller essays, which must, in due time, be reprinted, and even with Melanchthon in full sight, it is safe to say that the humanists would never have made the Reformation.
tions exerted by the present discourse, excepting only the immediate pleasure or uneasiness they may occasion." In assuming these impressions, he does not assume a perceiving mind, or a thing perceived, but as Reid met him at this early stage. "I never catch myself at any existence or action." He devotes the whole energy of his mind to showing that we know nothing but phenomena or appearances, but things appearing. He has an admirable sevenfold classification of relations, which he says may be divided into two classes,— into such as depend entirely on the ideas which he says "joins no new ideas to those which have ever since been agitated as to belief, but this is an illusion. In identity, and in time and space, we can never go beyond our impressions. He exerts his ingenuity in disparaging the evidence usually advanced in favor of miraculous occurrences, by showing how apt mankind are to be swayed on these subjects by fear, wonder, fancy, and the like. I allow, that, in the present advanced state of science, there is ample proof that there is a uniformity in nature; but let us place alongside of this the counterpart fact, that there is sufficient evidence of there being a supersensitive system. Let the cumulative proofs, external and internal, in behalf of Christianity, be advanced,— those derived from testimony and from prophecy; those drawn from the adaptation of the revelation to our nature, from the character of Jesus and from the unity of the doctrine and morality,— and we shall find in their consistency and congruity evidence of equal value to that which establishes the existence of system in nature. People commonly shrink from Hume's negations on the subject of natural religion; but he has had a large following in his utilitarian theory of morals. He holds that the mind has an original instinct, which tends to unite itself with the good and the evil. He maintains that virtue consists in the agreeable and the useful: "Vice and virtue may be compared to sound, color, heat, which, according to modern philosophy, are not qualities of objects, but perceptions of the mind." Virtue is distinguished by the pleasure, and vice by the pain, that any action, sentiment, or character gives us by the mere view and contemplation. He is to be opposed by showing, first that the moral power in man is more than an instinct, which tends to unite itself with the good and the evil; and, secondly, that the good, say piety, or justice, or benevolence, is perceived to be good in itself. It is to be shown specially that the conscience claims supremacy over all our voluntary states, and that the good implies obligation to perform it.
HUME's "Treatise of Human Nature" contains the substance of all his philosophy. The publication of it (1738-39) constitutes an era in the history of philosophy. He tore down the old and venerable edifice, and henceforth men have had to build anew, and from the foundation. His earliest opponents were Thomas Reid (1783-84) and Immanuel Kant (1781). As his principles undermined all religion, natural and revealed, theologians have to examine them.

There is an edition of Hume's Philosophical Works, in 4 vols., Edinburgh, 1826 (A. Black), and an edition of his Treatise of Human Nature, by T. H. Green and T. H. Grose, with Dissertations and Notes on the principles of Hegel, London, 1878. I may be permitted to add that I have an article on Hume in my Social Philosophy.

JAMES MCCOOL.

HUMERALE. See Vestments.

HUMILIAI was the name of an association formed by some Milanese noblemen, on their return from German captivity, in the eleventh or twelfth century. In the middle of the twelfth century an association a religious order grew up, bearing the same name, and confirmed by Innocent III. in 1201. The members of the lay association afterwards fell in with the Arnoldists and the Waldenses, and the religious order also degenerated.

In 1569 Cardinal Borromeo attempted to reform it, but nearly fell a victim to the violence of the monks; after which Pius V. dissolved the order, in 1571. A female order of Humiliati, also called the "Nuns of Biassoni," was founded by Clara Biassoni of Milan in 1100, and still exists. See Hieronymus Tiberopoulos: Vetera Huminilitarum monumenta, Milan, 1786-88, T. III. ZÖCKLER.

HUMILIATION OF CHRIST. See Christology.

HUMILITY, a virtue opposed to pride and self-conceit, by reason of which a man thinks of himself no more highly than he ought to think (Rom. xii. 3), and places himself in subjection to him to whom he owes subjection. This person is primarily God; so that humility is, first of all, the sense of absolute dependence upon him. In the strict sense of the term, humility is proper only in man's relations to God, and modesty in man's relations to man (De Wette). It is not merely the sense of God's infinitude over against human limitation, but of God's holiness over against man's moral deficiency and guilt. Sophocles came nearest to the true conception of humility in classical antiquity. It runs like a thread through all the piety of the Old Testament (Gen. xlv. 8) down to John the Baptist (Matt. iii. 2), and Christ, although without sin, was imbued with childlike humility (Matt. xix. 17; John v. 30), and made it a condition of entrance into the kingdom of heaven (Matt. v. 3, xvii. 2). It must actuate the Christian at all times, and remind him to work out his salvation with fear and trembling (Phil. ii. 12). Love, which is the pulse-beat of the Christian life, is influenced by it, and held back from the errors of mysticism and quietism; it converts it into adoring reverence for God, trust in and obedience to him, even in sufferings (1 Pet. v. 6). A sham humility betrays itself in its behavior to mankind (Luke xviii. 13 sqq.). It is free from all vain self-conceit, but at the same time is conscious of man's dignity in the sight of God, and may be said to ascend upwards on the six steps of patience, meekness, kindness, friendliness, peaceableness, and placability (Arndt).—virtues which the apostles so urgently insist upon. See the various works on Christian ethics.

E. SCHWARZ.

HUMPHREY, Herman, D.D., b. in West Sims-
bury, Conn., March 26, 1779; d. at Pittsfield in 1858. He graduated at Yale College in 1805: was a Congregational pastor at Fairfield, Conn., at Pittsfield, Mass.; then president of Amherst College for twenty-three years (1823-45). He was one of the best and weightiest men of his day, and exerted a wide influence in shaping its religious movements, especially in the Congregational and Presbyterian churches. He contributed largely to the religious press, wrote able pamphlets against intemperance and slavery, and was the author of a number of books, among them a Tour in France, Great Britain, and Belgium, in two volumes. (See Tyler's History of Amherst College.) Zephaniah Moore, D.D., son of the preceding, was born and reared by his father; d. in Cincinnati, Nov. 18, 1881; graduated at Amherst College and at Andover Theological Seminary; pastor of churches at Racine and Milwaukee, Wis., 1850-58, of First Presbyterian Church, Chicago, 1858-68, of Calvary Church, Philadelphia, 1868-75; professor of ecclesiastical history and church polity in Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, 1876-81; and moderator of the General Assembly at Chicago in 1871. He was a gifted preacher, and a faithful servant of Christ.

G. L. PRENTICE.

HUNDESHAQEN, Karl Bernhard, b. in Frieden-
wald, Hesse, Jan. 10, 1810; d. in Bonn, June 2, 1873; was one of the most prominent and original theologians which the Reformed Church of Germany has given in this century to the service of the Evangelical Church. His peculiar importance consisted in this, that in his own way he showed how certain features of the Reformed Church might be advantageously applied to the living Christianity of the day. He emphasized the ethical principle in Protestantism over against a mere dogmatic or critical intellectualism, and laid stress upon the social element in the Church, which was languishing because of its amalgamation with the State. He entered the University of Giessen at fifteen, and passed from there to Halle, where he became a favorite pupil of Ullmann. In 1830 he went back to Giessen as rector of the Seminary, and in 1834 accepted a call to a professorship in the newly founded University of Bonn. In 1840 his anonymous work, D. deutsche Protestantismus, s. Vergangenheit u. u. heutigen Lebensfragen, etc., appeared, and fell like a flash of lightning in that troubled period. Two more editions were called for in 1847 and 1850. With an intense earnestness of purpose he then devoted himself to the study of church and state problems, as revealed by flashes of humor, the author showed the intimate connection of the religious and national condition of Germany, and upheld the central act of the Reformation as an act, not of science, but of conscience, and as calling for imitation. From this he passed over to the ecclesiastical questions of the day. This work made Hundeshagen's reputation, and he was at once called to the chair of New-Testament exegesis and church history at Heidelberg, where he continued to labor for

HUNDESHAQEN.
twenty years (1847—67). In 1864 he published his great contribution to the literature of the relations of the State to the Church, — Beiträge zur Kirchenverfassung u. Kirchenpolitik, insbesondere d. Protestantismus. But the last years of his stay in Heidelberg were marred by a disagreement between him and the administration of the Church to the government of Baden, which were entirely at discord with his own views, and by the isolated position of the faculty in which Umbreit's death left him. He gladly accepted a call to Bonn in 1867, where he spent his last years in peaceful and friendly relations with his colleagues, although a great sufferer in body. He rejoiced in the restoration of the German Empire in 1870, and greeted the hour of his departure with Christian fortitude and joyfulness. A collection of his shorter writings was edited in 2 vols. by Dr. Christlieb, Gotha, 1874. See CHRISTLIEB: K. B. Hunderhagen, Eine Lebensskizze, Gotha, 1873.

WILLIBALD BEY SCHLAG.

HUNGARY, THE KINGDOM OF, consists of Hungary Proper, the principality of Transylvania, the provinces of Croatia, Slavonia, and the Military Frontier, and comprises an area of 124,234 square miles, with 15,509,455 inhabitants, of whom 5,133,450 are Roman Catholics; 1,113,508 are Lutherans, 2,031,243, Calvinists; 54,822, Unitarians; 583,641, Jews, etc. When the Magyars first crossed the Carpathian range, and settled in the plains of the Danube and the Theiss, they were still heathens. They had no idols, no temples, no priests. Sacrifices, especially of horses, were presented at certain occasions. The oath was sacred to them, and marriage was accomplished with religious ceremonies. A century later (972) they became acquainted with Christianity, when their duke, Geyza, married a Christian princess, Sarolta, a daughter of the Roman Church, which finally converted the Magyars. The lively political relations which soon sprang up between the Magyar duke and the German emperor made it easier for the German missionary to penetrate into the country; and it was Adalbert of Prague who in 994 baptized Geyza's son Volko, and gave him the name of Stephen. Stephen, afterwards known as St. Stephen of Hungary, changed the constitution from a tribal union to a kingdom, and accomplished the christianization of the people, travelling from one end of the country to the other, preaching, baptizing, building churches and monasteries, founding schools, organizing governments, and establishing authorities. From Pope Sylvester II. he received a golden crown and the title of apostolic king; and in 1000 he was solemnly crowned by the Archbishop of Gran. At a diet held shortly after, he made a law by which the free state of the people, gave the bishops rich donations, introduced the tithe, enforced the celebration of Sunday, the Friday fast, etc. In no other country the Roman Church attained such a power and such a wealth as in Hungary. A curious testimony of her influence is found in the circumstance that the Latin language became the official language, not only of the church, the university, and the school, but also of the government, the administration, and the court, and continued so till the beginning of the present century. When the Reformation arose in Germany, and became known in Hungary through the writings of the Reformers, the Hungarian Church seemed to be singularly well prepared for the encounter. A diet of 1523 decreed that Protestantism should be stamped out; that all Lutherans, and even their abettors, should be seized and burnt, etc. But Aug. 29, 1526, the battle of Mohacz was fought. The King, Louis II., fell, the last scion of the native dynasty, and around him most of the chiefs of the great families. The Turks occupied one part of the country; and two pretenders, Zapolya, and Ferdinand of Austria, fought about the other. Under such circumstances the religious affairs were for some time entirely lost sight of; and the Reformation was allowed to spread, as it caused no disturbance. It quietly took possession of the ground, priest and congregation, compromising with each other; and when, in 1540, Leonhard Stibbeck drew up the new confession, King Ferdinand accepted it, and confirmed it. The first forebodings of coming troubles appeared within the Protestant camp itself. The Lutherans and Calvinists hated each other more than they hated the Romanists; and when Rudolph I. ascended the throne in 1577, and the Jesuits were recalled, and formally installed at Thurzó, intrigues, violence, and soon actual persecution began. The Protestants rose in revolt, led by Prince Bocskaj of Transylvania, and compelled the king to the so-called "peace of Vienna" (1566), which granted freedom of conscience, and liberty of worship. The articles of this treaty were incorporated with the laws of the land by the Diet of Pressburg (1808), in spite of the protest of the Roman-Catholic bishops; and, when Rudolph made an attempt at cancelling the whole treaty, he was deposed, and his brother Matthias raised on the throne (1611). But, however, who, though born of Protestant parents, entered the order of the Jesuits, and finally became Archbishop of Gran, the Roman-Catholic Church found the right tool to work with. More than fifty noble families he succeeded in bringing back to the Roman faith; and with the magnates they followed their whole retinues. Thus re-enforced, and strongly supported by the court, the Roman Church began a warfare of open attack. The Protestants were deprived of their church-buildings, prevented from making complaints at the diets, compelled to pay for the support of the Roman clergy, forced to participate in processions in honor of the Virgin and the saints, accused of the most horrible crimes,—conspiracy with the Turks, seditions against the king, etc. Twice they rose in open rebellion, under the lead of the Rákoczy, father and son; and both times they were successful. By the peace of Lissa (1665), and that of Szatmár (1686), the rights which they had obtained by the peace of Vienna were recognized and confirmed. But the treaties were made only to be broken; and the state of the evangelical churches in Hungary was very precarious, when the Edict of Tolerance of Joseph II.
HUNNIUS.
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(Oct. 29, 1781) at once effected a radical change. The Protestants were in all essential points placed on an equal footing with the Roman Catholics; and in this arrangement the legislation of Joseph's successor, Leopold, especially the law of 1791, made no material alterations.

At present the Roman-Catholic Church has seventeen bishops in Hungary, and four archbishops,—zagreb (Agram), sier (Erlau), Kalocsa, and Esztergom (Gran), of whom the last is the primate of the whole Church, and bears the title of prince. The Greek Catholic Church (Greek in confession and rite, but under Roman jurisdiction) has six bishops; the Armenian Catholic Church two. The Greek Church has a metropolitan at Carlowitz with five suffragan bishops, and an archbishop at Nagyzezeben (Hermannstadt) with two. In the evangelical churches each congregation elects its own eldership, which appoints the pastor, and governs all the affairs of the congregation. Several congregations form a seniorate; several seniorates, a superintendency. There are five Lutheran and five Calvinist superintendencies. Of the forty-five theological institutions, which in 1878 labored with 284 professors and 1,534 students, twenty-five belonged to the Roman-Catholic Church, four to the Greek Catholic, three to the Greek Church, seven to the Lutheran, and five to the Calvinist. See Geschichte d. evang. Kirche in Ungarn, Berlin, 1854.

HUNNIUS, Egidius, b. at Winnenden, Wurtemberg, Dec. 21, 1590; d. at Wittenberg, April 4, 1680; studied at Tubingen, and was appointed professor of theology at Marburg 1576, and at Wittenberg 1592. He was a stanch champion of Lutheran orthodoxy. During his stay in Marburg he opposed, in preaching and writing, the reigning Calvinistic tendency, and succeeded in forming a party which finally effected an ecclesiastical split between Upper and Lower Hesse. In Wittenberg he was a member of the Committee on Visitation, and contributed much to suppress all Philistian traditions. A collected edition of his Latin works, among which are De persona Christi, Calvinus judaizans, etc., appeared at Wittenberg, 1607-09, in 3 vols. fol.

HUNNIUS, Nicolaus, b. at Marburg, July 11, 1555; d. at Lübeck, April 12, 1648; studied theology at Wittenberg, and was appointed superintendent of Eilenburg 1612, professor of theology at Wittenberg 1617, and pastor of the Church of St. Mary in Lübeck 1622. He followed the same theological direction as his father, inherited his temper and talent as a polemist, and was, like him, possessed of great learning. He wrote against the Roman Church, Demonstratio Ministerii Lutherani a Catharum Doctrina parasitum, etc. 1617; against the Photinians, Examen errornum Photinianorum, 1620; and, against the enthusiasts of his time, Christliche Betrachtung, 1622; Ausführlicher Bericht von der neuen Propheten, 1634; etc. In Lübeck he revived the Ministerium tripolitanum, an association between the clergy of Lübeck, Hamburg, and Lüneburg; and by his Consultatio (1832) he gave the idea of a Collegium irenicum, or Collegium Hunniunum, which was intended to form a kind of supreme court for all theological controversies. His biography was written by Heller, Lübeck, 1843.

HUNTING AMONG THE HEBREWS—In the Bible we find hunting connected with royalty as early as in the days of Nimrod, who "was a mighty hunter before the Lord" (Gen. x. 9). The patriarchs were rather herdsmen than hunters: only Ishmael was an archer (Gen. xxi. 20), and Esau a cunning hunter (Gen. xxv. 27). That beasts of the chase were plentiful in the land of promise we see from Exod. xxiii. 29. From the provision made in Lev. xvii. 13, it is manifest that hunting was practised after the settlement in Canaan, and was pursued with the view of obtaining food (Deut. xii. 22). That birds were also shot we may infer from 1 Sam. xxvii. 20; but the law provided for their protection (Deut. xxvii. 6 sq.). Quiver and bow (Gen. xxvii. 3) were generally used as hunting utensils. Various missiles, pitfalls, snares, and gins were made use of in hunting (2 Sam. xxvii. 20; Ps. xci. 3; Amos iii. 5). That hunting continued to be followed till towards the end of the Hebrew monarchy we see from Josephus, War, I. 21, 13.

LEYRER.

HUNTINGDON, Selina, Countess of, a distinguished supporter of evangelical piety and the Methodist movement; b. Aug. 24, 1707, at Stanton Harold in Leicestershire; d. June 17, 1781, at Washington Shirley, Earl of Ferrers, and in 1728 married the Earl of Huntingdon. Under the influence of the Earl's sisters and a severe illness, she became deeply interested in religion, and with her husband attended the meetings of the Methodist Society in Petterlane, London, from its organization, in 1738. She lost all her children, and in 1746 died. From this time on, Lady Huntingdon devoted herself uninterruptedly to the advancement of religion. Among her friends in the ministry were Doddridge, John Wesley, and Fletcher; and Whitefield and Romains acted as her chaplains. Her house in Park Street, London, she opened for preaching-services, to which her social connections, and the estimation in which she was held, drew many persons of high rank, among whom were Bolingbroke and Chesterfield. She built numerous chapels,—the expenses of the first, at Brighton (1761), being met by the sale of her jewels, amounting to seven hundred pounds,—and in 1768 founded the theological seminary of Trevecca in Southern Wales, which, after her death, was removed to Chestnut Herts. When the breach occurred between Wesley and Whitefield, Huntingdon took sides with the latter, and at his death (1777) became sole trustee of his institutions in Georgia. But she did not leave the Church of England till 1779. and then she was forced to it in order to avoid the injunction against her chaplains' preaching in the Diocese of Chester. When the breach occurred between Wesley and Whitefield, Huntingdon took sides with the latter, and at the time of her death there were sixty-four belonging to what was called "the Countess of Huntingdon Connexion." These congregations were in polite Congregationalist, in doctrine Calvinistic, and in worship used the Book of Common Prayer. According to Whitaker's Almanac for 1882, the "Connexion" now only has thirty-four chapels. See Life and Times of Selina, Countess of Huntingdon, London, 1840, 2 vols.; A. H. New: The Coronet and the Cross, or Memoirs of Selina Countess of Huntingdon, London, 1807.

HUPFELD, Hermann (Christian Karl Friedrich),
HURD, Richard, Bishop of Worcester; b. of humble parents at Congreve, Staffordshire, Jan. 13, 1720; d. May 28, 1789; in 1739 graduated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and was elected fellow 1742. He became rector of Thurcaston 1757, preacher of Lincoln's Inn 1768, archdeacon of Gloucester 1767, and bishop of Lichfield and Coventry 1774, from which he was translated in 1781 to the see of Worcester. In 1783 he was offered the see of Canterbury, which he declined on the ground of its being a "charge not suited to his temper and talents, and much too heavy for him to sustain, especially at this time." Bishop Hurd was a man of much polish and elegance of manner, and was pronounced by George III. "the most naturally polite man he had ever known." He kept up a sumptuous retinue, but with these tastes combined literary ambitions. Among his other works are a Commentary on Horace's Ars Poetica, 1749, 4th ed., 1753; a volume of Moral and Political Dialogues (sincerity, retirement, etc.), 1759; 3 vols. of Sermons, 1776-80. He edited the Works of Warburton, 7 vols., 1788. His most ambitious theological work was Introduction to the Study of the Prophecies, 1772 (1778, 2 vols.). His collected Works with an Autobiography appeared in 8 vols., 1811. See Kilvert: Life and Writings of Bishop Hurd, London, 1860.

HURTER, Friedrich Emanuel von, b. at Schaffhausen, Switzerland, of Protestant parents, March 19, 1737; d. at Graz, Aug. 27, 1865. He studied theology in Göttingen; in 1824 was chief pastor in Schaffhausen, and in 1835 dean of the synod, but was converted to Roman Catholicism through his historical studies, and in 1844 entered that church. He was called to Vienna in 1845 as imperial counsel and historiographer, and in 1851 ennobled under the title Von Amann. Besides controversial writings, he was the author of the famous Geschichte d. Papiest Innocenz III. u. seiner Zeitgenossen, Hamburg, 1834-42, 4 vols.; and an account of his conversion, which is said to be one of the best books of its class: Geburt u. Wieder-geburt, Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben u. Blüche auf die Kirche, Schaffhausen, 1845, 4 vols., 4th ed., 1867, 2 vols. His life was written by one of his sons, Graz, 1870, 2 vols. Two of his sons have taken prominent places in the Roman Church.

HUS, John, Bohemian reformer and martyr; b. in 1369 [according to Gillett, July 6, 1373], at Hussinetz, Bohemia, not far from the Bavarian line; d. at the stake, in Constance, Germany, July 6, 1415. Hus is an abbreviation of Hussinetz, and was used by him from 1396. His parents were Czechs, in comfortable circumstances. John studied at Prague, taking the degree of Bachelor of Theology in 1394, and Master of Arts in 1396. In 1398 he delivered his first lectures, in 1401 was made dean of the philosophical faculty, and in 1403 rector of the university. He was a constant student of Wiclif's works; and it is altogether likely, that in following the rule that a bachelor might only lecture upon the treatises of a Prague, Parisian, or Oxford master, Hus took up Wiclif. It is, at any rate, a noticeable coincidence that a manuscript containing five of Wiclif's philosophical writings, preserved at Stockholm, was written by Hus in 1398.

In 1402 Hus was made pastor of the Bethlehem Church, which was founded (1391) to afford preaching for the Czechs. This position brought him into close contact with the common people, and stimulated him to a closer study of Scripture, as well as to the study of Wiclif. In 1403, when the period from 1402 to 1410 Hus hoped to effect a religious reformation, with the aid of his ecclesiastical superiors. A disputation of the
year 1403 led the authorities to forbid the publication of forty-five theses of Wiclif at the university; but, five years later, the interdiction was confirmed only to the extent that no one should give them an heretical construction. Hus had the full confidence of the archbishop, Dr. Sbrokko, and was appointed synodical preacher by him. At the opening of the provincial synod, he repeatedly took occasion to lay bare the errors, and denounce the sins, of the clergy. With two others, he was appointed by the archbishop to investigate the alleged miracles performed by the blood of Christ in the church at Wilsnack. They were denounced a deception, and formed the occasion of Hus's pamphlet, All the Blood of Christ is Gloried. Here he bids Christians seek, not for signs and miracles, but search the Scriptures. But his relations to the archbishop changed, and in 1408 he was prohibited from exercising priestly functions within the diocese. The complete rupture was still to come.

In 1409 the University of Prague lost all its foreign students in consequence of a royal decree giving the Bohemian students three votes, the others only one. Leipzig University was founded; but in Prague an intense national spirit henceforth prevailed, which demanded ecclesiastical reforms. Hus was made rector, and was very popular, not only among the students, but at court. This freedom of inquiry excited the apprehension of the archbishop, who accused Hus to the Pope, apprising him, at the same time, of the wide prevalence of the doctrines of Wiclif. A papal bull of Dec. 20, 1409, prohibited the use of Wiclif's writings, and forbade preaching at places where the practice was not an ancient one. When the bull was announced (March 9, 1410), it aroused much opposition; but the archbishop executed it, burning on July 16 two hundred volumes of Wiclif, and declaring the indulgences to be a humbug. But Hus continued to preach, and the opposition increased. Verses lampooning the archbishop were sung to the streets, and even the lives of the priests menaced. Hus and his friends openly defended Wiclif's writings at the university; while the archbishop, in a synodical edict, condemned them as heretical. The congregations at the Bethlehem Church grew to a vast size. Hus became bolder and more outspoken; and his audiences frequently showed their approbation by applause. On March 15, 1411, he was excommunicated by the archbishop, and the city laid under an interdict. Both sentences were ignored; and the prelate was attempting to arrive at more decisive measures, interdicting Hus's place of residence, and threatening him with the civil ban. This was effective. At the king's request he left the city (December 1412), but not until he had written a work (the Appellatio), in which he appeals from the Roman curia to Christ the righteous Judge. He passed his exile at Kozhiradek and Krakowetz, near Prague, preaching to large concourses of people, and writing his principal work, De Ecclesia, which only reproduced Wiclif's De Ecclesia.

The religious agitation of Bohemia had become matter of European notoriety, and King Sigismund (of Hungary) decided that the case ought to be brought before the General Council about to be assembled at Constance. Hus cheerfully appeared to agree, on condition of his being free from the Roman curia to Christ the righteous Judge. He passed his exile at Kozhiradek and Krakowetz, near Prague, preaching to large concourses of people, and writing his principal work, De Ecclesia, which only reproduced Wiclif's De Ecclesia. The religious agitation of Bohemia had become matter of European notoriety, and King Sigismund (of Hungary) decided that the case ought to be brought before the General Council about to be assembled at Constance. Hus cheerfully agreed to appear, on condition of his being free from the Roman curia to Christ the righteous Judge. He passed his exile at Kozhiradek and Krakowetz, near Prague, preaching to large concourses of people, and writing his principal work, De Ecclesia, which only reproduced Wiclif's De Ecclesia.
burned. Hus fell on his knees, and, lifting up his hands, appealed to Heaven, and prayed for his enemies. Thereupon followed his degradation from the priestly office, and all cried out together, "Thy soul we deliver up to the Devil." Hus answered, "And I commend it to the holy Lord Jesus." Then a paper cap a yard high was placed on his head, with the writing, "Hussitana." He was then led forth to the judgment-square, his neck bound by a chain to a stake. As the flames rose around him, he refused again to recant, and died singing, "Christ, thou Son of the living God, have mercy upon me." His ashes were thrown into the Rhine.

Valid ground for the sentence of condemnation, even according to the canons of that day, there was none. Hus denied holding to Wiclif's views against transubstantiation, and his views upon conscience and Scripture, and not upon ecclesiastical authority. Judged by the canons of law then prevailing, Hus's death was a judicial murder.

Hus regarded the Scriptures as an infallible authority and the supreme standard of conduct. The other main subject of his teaching was the nature of the true Church, which, with Wiclif, he defined to be the body of the elect. Church-membership or ecclesiastical dignities were no infallible sign of election. He approved the communion under both kinds. According to the canons of that day, there was none. Hus denied holding to Wiclif's views against transubstantiation, and his views upon conscience and Scripture, and not upon ecclesiastical authority. Judged by the canons of law then prevailing, Hus's death was a judicial murder.

Hussites. The Bohemian followers of John Hus. The execution of Hus excited intense feeling in Bohemia and Moravia; and it was no wonder that some of the reformer's enemies among the priests were stabbed, or thrown into the Moldau, and that the archbishop himself barely escaped the wrath of the infuriated populace. The king, Wenceslaus, tried to maintain a neutral attitude between both parties. But in September, 1415, a large assembly was held, at which four hundred and fifty-two of the nobility signed a protest to the Council of Constance and approved the doctrines of Hus. On the 5th they formed a league for mutual aid in religious concerns, binding themselves to protect the free preaching of God's Word on their estates, and to recognize the edicts of prelates only so far as they accorded with the Scriptures.

The ecclesiastical party entered into a counter league; and the Council of Constance cited the nobles to appear before it, and even threatened (Feb. 24, 1410) Bohemia with a crusade. But the Hussites could not be so easily intimidated. Pope Martin V. inaugurated more energetic measures, and, after dissolving the council (April 22, 1418), determined to destroy the Bohemian heresy root and branch. Wenceslaus was persuaded in 1419 to move against it, and the Hussites at court were obliged to leave. On Aug. 16 the king died, but civil war had already begun.

What was the character of this Bohemian movement? First of all we are struck with the intense veneration for Hus. His followers, however, disavowed the name "Hussites," and wanted to be known as Catholic Christians. They were unanimous in regarding the Scriptures as the supreme authority in doctrine and life, but they split into two parties in the application of this principle. The radical wing, accepting only that which was expressly commanded in Scripture, rejected the doctrines of purgatory, the worship of saints, the use of a foreign tongue in public services, etc. The moderate wing accepted all ecclesiastical customs the Scriptures did not expressly forbid. They put forth the famous Four Prague Articles in Latin, Czech, and German, in July, 1420. These articles appealed (1) the free preaching of God's Word, (2) the distribution of the sacrament under two kinds, (3) the deprivation of the clergy of secular power and possessions which they used to the injury of their office and the state, and (4) the repression of mortal sins and public scandals. The moderate party was called the Praguers, and, later, Calixtines (from calix, "cup"), or Utaraquis. They had at their head Baron Czenko of Wartenberg. The radicals acknowledged Nicholas of Pistas and John Zizka as leaders, and were called Taborites, from the fortress of Tabor, sixty miles south of Prague, which they occupied.

From 1420 to 1425, Catholic Germany marched in crusades against the Hussites; but the latter were victorious, and, from 1427 on, took the offensive against their enemies under the generalship of Procopius the Great. Cardinal Julian Cesarini, after the ignominious defeat of the last crusade, which he led Aug. 14, 1431, concluded, as president of the Basel Council, that the only way to put down the heresy was by conciliatory treatment. In October the council invited the Bohemians to appear before it, but the delegates had conceded their main conditions at Eger. This was the first instance in the whole history of the Church for a council to treat upon
HUTTEN, Ulrich von, b. at Steckelberg, in the canton of Aargau, Aug. 15, 1488. He was the son of Hans von Hutten and the nephew of Ulrich von Hutten, a famous poet and historian. He was a prominent figure in the Thirty Years' War and played a significant role in the political and military conflicts of the time. He died in Zurich, Oct. 1, 1536.

HUTTINSON, Anne, a religious enthusiast who became known for her radical views on biblical interpretation. She was a member of the congregation at the Dutch Reformed Church in Boston and was known for her controversial sermons and writings. She died in Boston, Nov. 24, 1648.
HYMNOLOGY. Definition.—A hymn is a spiritual meditation in rhythmical prose or verse. Its chief constituents are praise and prayer to God. The definition of Augustine is too narrow for our modern conception, when he says a “hymn must contain praise, must praise God, and be sung” (opert, ut sit hymnus, habeat hac tria, laudem et Dei et canticum: Ps. lxixii.). On the other hand, the definition of the Greek and Latin churches is too comprehensive when it includes praises to saints among hymns. The writers of the New Testament use three terms (Eph. v. 19, etc.) for Christian songs,—psalm (psalmos), hymn (hymnos), and spiritual ode (psalmos). The word “hymn” was a common one among the Greeks, who with the Romans sang songs to their divinities and in honor of famous men. Such “hymns” are found in the poems of Homer, and Hesiod begins his Works and Days by invoking the Muses to sing “hymns” to Zeus, and speaks of them in his Theogony as singing “hymns to all the gods.” Pindar expressly calls his odes “hymns.” Paul, in his sermon on Mars Hill, quotes the words (Acts xvii. 28), “For we are his offspring,” from a “hymn” of Aratus of Cilicia (third century B.C.). The Christian hymn differs from the hymns of heathen antiquity in their spirit and the object of worship, but not necessarily in form. It is addressed to God, or one of the three persons of the Trinity, and admits nothing unchaste. It is the communion of the soul with God.

Hymns have from the earliest times entered as an important element into the services of the sanctuary, and have contributed at all periods to the piety of the Church. At the creation “the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy” (Job xxxviii. 7). Heaven itself is choral with anthems; and the angelic host sings, “Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory” (Isa. vi. 3). The best periods of Hebrew history were vocal with sacred song; and the fresh fervor of the early Christians found vent in singing. From the sixth century to this day, in the Greek and Latin churches, with some recent exceptions, the singing of hymns in the church has been restricted to the choir and clergy. The Flagellants of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries on the Continent (hymnos in latina vel vulgaris lingua, “they sung hymns in the Latin or vulgar tongue,” Summa Hist., Antoninus Florentinus (d. 1429), and the Lollards of the fourteenth in England, and also the Hussites of Bohemia in the fifteenth, re-
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vived the use of sacred songs amongst the people. The Protestant Reformation, under the lead of Luther, himself a devoted singer and vigorous hymnist, vindicated the right of the people to the use of hymns, and again identified congregational song with the exercises of worship. The subsequent Reformation in England in the last century was marked by great fertility in the production of hymns, in which the members of the Establishment (Toplady, Newton, etc.) vied with the leaders of the Methodist movement. Hymns, as Bishop Nicetius of Treves (c. 563) said (De Psalmis bono), "have consoled the sad, checked the joyful, subdued the enraged, refreshed the poor." They have been on the tongues of believers in the first asparks of their faith, and have ascended as the last fervid utterances of martyrs at the stake, from Polycarp (Martyr. Polyc., § 14) to Huss, and Jerome of Prague, and are chanted by the church triumphant in the presence of the Redeemer (Rev. v. 9, xiv. 3, etc.). They are the common heritage of all believers, and bind together all ages. In them denominational distinctions are lost sight of; and it is made plain that Christian faith, hope, and love exist, in their purity, in all communions of the Church. The hymns of Ambrose, and John of Damascus, Luther and Tersteegen, Wesley and Toplady, Muhlenberg and John Henry Newman, stand side by side in our hymn-books, and are consentient in praise to the one God, and love for the one Saviour.

Hebrew Hymns. — From very early times the Hebrews sang hymns commemorating the might and excellency of Jehovah. The songs of Miriam (Exod. xv. 21), Moses (Exod. xv. 1–19; Deut. xxxii. 1–43), Deborah (Judg. v. 1 sqq.), and Hannah (1 Sam. ii. 1–9), are sacred hymns, full of sublime imagery, and inflamed with a fervid devotion to Jehovah. The Book of Psalms is the oldest hymn-book in existence. Although sung by the shepherd of Bethlehem and other Psalmists, many centuries before Christ, it has been in all ages of the Christian Church, and continues to be, a fresh and living fountain of devotion and praise. Even in captivity the Hebrew people did not forget to sing, but mingled praises with their laments, although it was hard to sing "the Lord's song in a strange land." (Ps. cxxxvii. 4). The Psalms were sung to musical accompaniment (1 Chron. vi. 31; 2 Chron. xx. 21, etc.). Under David, and subsequently, the Jews had organized choirs; and there returned with Zerubbabel more than two hundred "singing-men and singing-women" (EZ. ii. 65; Neh. vii. 67). See art. PSALMS.

Early Christian Hymns. — At the threshold of the Christian dispensation we have the sublime songs of Mary, called the Magnificat, from the first word of the Latin translation (Luke i. 46–55); of Zacharias, called the Benedictus, likewise from the Latin translation of the first word "blessed" (Luke i. 68–79); of the angels, called the Gloria in Excelsis, "Glory in the highest" (Luke ii. 14); and of Simon, called the Nunc Dimittis, "Now lettest" (Luke ii. 29–32). Portions of the New Testament have so much the form of hymns as to give the impression that they are actually fragments of hymns (Acts iv. 24–30; Eph. v. 14; I Tim. iii. 16; vi. 16; Jas. i. 17; Rev. xv. 3, etc.). The Saviour, at the conclusion of the last passover, sang a hymn (a part of the Hallel, Ps. cxv.–cxviii.) with his disciples (Matt. xxvi. 30). The early Christians used hymns as a means of edification (1 Cor. xiv. 26; Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 17), and interrupted the recitation of psalms with a hymn, as a means of impressing on the memory of the people the solemnity of festal occasions in his day. They commemorated some of the great facts in the Saviour's life from the nativity to the ascension,—the deaths of pious persons and the lives of martyrs.

There is evidence from heathen as well as Christian sources, that singing formed an important part of the Christian services in the post-apostolic age. Early in the second century, Pliny writes to Trajan that the Christians were in the habit of meeting before daylight, and of singing songs to Christ as God among themselves alternately (Stato ante lucem, Deo diceres ecum invicem). Lord Selborne finds in the last words a reference to responsive singing. None of the hymns of the second century have been preserved. The hymn Light of Gladness, Beam Divine (παντας θαυμων πνευμα), which is still sung in the Greek Church, has been attributed to Athenagoras (d. 169), but without sufficient reason. Basil (d. 379) refers to it as an ancient composition, but denies that Athenagoras was the author. The oldest Christian hymn in existence is the shepherd of Tender Youth (στοιγμων πνευμα), which Dr. Schaff, in Christ in Song, p. 454, characterizes as a "sublime but somewhat turgid song of praise to Christ." It is a free transposition of a hymn of Clement of Alexandria, composed about the year 200. After the third century, it is convenient to distinguish between the hymnody of the Eastern and Latin churches.

Hymns of the Eastern Church. — So general and popular was the custom of singing hymns in the third century, that one of the charges put forth by the second council of Antioch (299), in its letter to the Bishops of Rome and Alexandria against Paul of Samosata, was that he had put a stop to it. In the fourth century, according to Theodoret (1 H. E., ii. 24), antiphonalsinging was introduced into Constantinople, which in this respect followed the lead of the church of Antioch. While Chrysostom (d. 407) was archbishop of Constantinople, the Trinitarian party was accustomed to gather in the open spaces of the city, and marched in midnight processions, singing sacred music as an effective means of defeating the Arians, who had hymns of their own. According to Cardinal Pitra, the number of Greek hymns is very large; and, if those that have been published were collected, they would fill fifteen or twenty volumes, while the number that exist only in manuscripts is equally large.

Ephraem Syrus (d. about 378) is the father of Christian hymnody in the Syrian Church. He wrote in Syriac, and seems to have gotten the impulse to write hymns from the religious songs of the Gnostic poet, Bardesanes. He was a fertile writer. Theodoret speaks of Ephraem's hymns as sweet, and contributes to the solemnity of festal occasions in his day. They commemorated some of the great facts in the Saviour's life from the nativity to the ascension,—the deaths of pious persons and the lives of martyrs.
Hymn-writing also flourished in Spain in the fifth century; and some of the finest Latin hymns are by Prudentius, a Spanish layman, who died in 405. His hymns, about fifteen in number, were taken from larger books, and, according to Lord Selborne, are "full of fervor and sweetness." That on the birth of Christ, Bethlehem of Noblest Cities (O sola magnarum urbium) is one of the most finished and chaste on that event; and the hymn on the martyrs of Bethlehem, Hail, Infant Martyrs (Salve, flores martyrum), is justly admired. Sedulius, a native of Scotland or Ireland, of the sixth century, also wrote some fine hymns.

Gregory, Bishop of Rome (d. 604), and Fortunatus, Bishop of Poitiers (d. 809), mark the transition to the medieval period of Latin hymnody. The Ambrosian music, which had held undisputed sway for two centuries, was supplanted by the Gregorian. The recitative was introduced, and public song in the church restricted to the choir of priests, the congregation being limited to the responses. The two best hymns of Fortunatus are, The Royal Banner is unfurled (Vexilla Regis), and Sing, my Tongue, the Saviour's Battle (Pange, lingua).

The hymns of the middle ages have their own peculiar characteristics. The joyful, jubilant tone of the Ambrosian and Prudentian hymns is no longer so prominent: they are set in the key of mystic fervor. Begotten in the cloister, they ring with the soft and subdued but ardent tones of contemplative devotion. The singers linger near the cross, and gaze upon the suffering agonies of its scenes, rather than breathe the clear air of the resurrection morning, or celebrate the triumphant exaltation and reign of Christ. Some of these hymns were by the most subtle theologians and devout saints, and, with some of the great theological ideas of Anselm, are the most precious legacies of the medieval Church. Some of them have never been surpassed.

Amongst others we pass by, with simple mention, the Venerable Bede, the monk of Yarrow (d. 735), who was not only the father of English learning but the first English hymn-writer; and Notker of St. Gall (d. 912), who was led by the sound of a mill-wheel to compose a new kind of hymns known as "sequences." One of the sweetest hymns of this period is ascribed to Robert, king of France (d. 1031), and has been appropriated by all hymn-books, — Come, Holy Ghost, in Love (Veni, Sancte Spiritus). Adam of St. Victor (d. 1172), whom Archbishop Trench and Dr. Neale agree in pronouncing "the greatest of medieval poets," made the monastery of St. Victor, just outside the city of Paris, no less famous by his hymns, than his teachers, Hugo of St. Victor (d. 1136), who had done by his writings, which founded the mysticism of medieval France. In the judgment of Dr. Neale, his best hymn is Be the Cross our Theme and Story (Laudes crucis). Two other medieval convents will always be associated with church hymnody. Clairvaux, through Bernard (d. 1153), from the greatest man of his age, and one of the purest saints of any age, gave to the Church the hymn Hail, thou Head, so bruised and wounded (Salve, Caput cruentatum), and a poem of two hundred lines, from which have been taken the three hymns, — Jesus, the very Thought of thee (Jesu, dulcissim memoria), Jovis loque vicis, Joy of Loving Hearts (Jesu, dulcedo cordium), and...
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O Jesus, King most Wonderful (Jesus, rex admirabilis).—Cluny, through another Bernard, gave to the Church a long poem of three thousand lines, from which have been extracted several hymns breathing an ardent longing for the heavenly country, of which an extract, the Golden (Urbe Syon aurea) is the most familiar.

The grandest hymn of the middle ages, and perhaps of all ages, is the Dies Irae of Thomas of Celano (d. about 1250), the friend and biographer of Francis d'Assisi. It has never been equalled as a sublime and reverential description of the awe and terror of the last judgment, and has exercised the skill of many translators. Walter Scott, without translating the letter, has preserved the spirit, of the original in the three verses beginning,—

"That day of wrath, that dreadful day,
When heaven and earth shall pass away!"

Dr. Schaff says (Christ in Song, p. 290), "This marvellous hymn is the acknowledged masterpiece of Latin poetry, and the most sublime of all uninspired hymns. It is one of those rare productions which can never die, but which increase in value as the ages advance. The secret of its irresistible power lies in the awful grandeur of the theme, the intense earnestness and pathos of the poet, the simple majesty and solemn music of its language," etc. If the Dies Irae excels all other hymns in grandeur, then another hymn of the middle ages — the Stabat Mater ("At the Cross her station keeping") of Jacopone da Todi, or Jacobus de Benedictis (d. 1306) — stands unapproached for pathos. Its deep tone of sorrow charms the ear, and melts the heart, in spite of its Mariolatry. Among other hymn-writers of the middle ages the greatest are Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) and Bonaventura (d. 1274). To the former belong four sacramental hymns, — Sing, my Tongue, the Mystery telling (Pange, linguagloriosi), etc.; to the latter, Jesus, thy Holy Cross and Dying (Recordare sanctae crucis). To this class of hymns, though later in time, belong the hymns of Francis Xavier (d. 1552), the famous missionary of China ("I love thee, not because"), and of Saint Theresa (d. 1652); and in general it may be said that the best hymns of the Roman-Catholic Church since, like those of Madame Guyon, the Lead, Kindly Light of John Henry Newman, and the hymns of Faber, are set in the key of medieval hymnody.


German Hymns. — Germany possesses not only a more voluminous but a richer hymnology than any other country. In 1786 Ludwig von Hardenberg prepared a list of 72,792 German hymns, arranged in alphabetical order. The number now contains from a hundred thousand, and among these are many of the choicest pieces of religious poetry, overflowing with devotion, and praise to the Redeemer. The introduction of hymns and congregational singing into the public services was one of the first results of the Reformation in Germany, and that country had a fine supply of hymns long before any were composed in English.

The father of German hymnody, as of German church music, was Martin Luther (d. 1546). Among the works of Hus (d. 1415) which the Bohemian Brethren sent to Luther were that martyr's hymns; and he subsequently made a free translation of Hua's Jesus Christus, nostra Salus. In 1533 Luther published eight hymns of his own, which had increased to a hundred and twenty-five in 1545. These hymns were carried by travelling singers from village to village, and sung in the hearts of the German people. Coleridge's statement was exaggerated, namely that "Luther did as much for the Reformation by his hymns as by his translation of the Bible;" but his hymns were effective agencies for spreading the Reformation. The Roman-Catholic theologian Conzenius (1620) wrote that the "hymns of Luther have destroyed more souls than his writings and sermons."

Luther's hymns were joyful and confident outbursts of a manly and unwavering trust in God. His whole personality breathes through Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott, translated by Carlyle "A safe Stronghold our God is still." It was the triumphant trumpet-blast of the Reformation, and bade defiance to satanic and human foes. It is as much the great popular song of the German nation as Luther himself is the hero and typical representative of German life. His other hymns are pregnant with Christian thought and joyfulness; as, "For God and Country," or "The Wohnraum der Morgenstern" ("How lovely shines the Mornin Star!"); "I love thee, not because," and IVieschöhn leuchtet der [Morgenstern]. Luther had co-laborers in this field. Among these were Justus Jonas, Eber, and Michael Weiss (d. 1540). The latter, in 1531, edited German translations of the hymns of the Bohemian Brethren, to which he added some of his own.

The Lutheran Church was not only in advance of the Reformed Church of Germany in the department of hymnody, but its contributions have continued to be much the more numerous. The best hymn-writer of the sixteenth century was Philip Nicolai (d. 1608), a pious teacher. During a violent pestilence in 1597, he wrote one of the grandest and also one of the sweetest hymns in the German or any other language, "Wacht! the startling watch cry pealeth!" and Wie schön leuchtet der Morgenstern ("How lovely shines the Morning Star!") — two hymns which stand up side by side like twin peaks. The period of the Thirty-years' War (1618-48) was fruitful in fine hymns, among which are the battle-song of Gustav Adolph (d. 1632), before the fatal day of Lützen, Verzagen nicht, du Haufflein klein ("Fear not, O little flock, the foe"), and the very rugged thanksgiving hymn of Rink-
A rich Christian experience. The hymns of whose real name was Hardenberg, died prematurely (d. 1649), which is so popular in Germany, pathos, and devotion to the Master, which his transition to the Catholic Church (in 1661) did not change. One of his sweetest hymns is Ich will dich lieben, meine Stärke ("Thee will I love, my Strength, my Tower").

German hymnology reached its culminating point in Paul Gerhardt, a Lutheran pastor (d. 1676). Knapp calls him "beyond dispute, the first of German church poets." More than thirty of his hundred and twenty-three hymns are classical. Among his best is Wie soll ich dich empfangen ("Oh! how shall I receive Thee"), and Befiehl du deine Wege ("Give the winds thy fears"); but it is difficult to make a selection where so many are so uniformly excellent.

The first hymn-writer of the Reformed Church was Joachim Neander (d. 1680), who died, as pastor in Bremen, at the early age of thirty. He came under the influence of Spener. His hymns are "full of spiritual depth and Union." His Lob den Herren den machtigen König der Ehren ("Praise to Jehovah! the Almighty King of Creation") is a jubilant song of thanksgiving, and one of the most popular in Germany. The school of Pietists, of the latter part of this and the beginning of the eighteenth century, was fertile in the production of hymns: Spener (d. 1705), Franke (1727), and Freylinghausen (d. 1739) were the most prominent. Schmolke (d. 1737), a pastor in Silesia, was a copious author of hymns. They are pervaded with Christian warmth and devotion, and of some of them are of perpetual value.

His Mein Jesu wie du wirst has passed into many English collections in the translation, "My Jesus, grow thou in me," and Freylinghausen's, There and far do we thine steps pursue ("Wie sollich dich empfangen") is much sung.

The early part of the present century witnessed a great revival of interest in church hymnody in Germany. It was led by Schleiermacher, Claus Harms, Arndt (v. Wort u. Kirchenlied, 1819), and others, and was contemporary with, if not a product of, the great national Luther tri-centennial of 1817. The hymns of the old writers had been subjected to ruthless treatment at the hands of the rationalists and literati of the eighteenth century. Even such a man as Schlegel felt justified, in order to avoid the elision, to alter the first line of Luther's great hymn to Ein starker Schutz ("Give me what is best") in order to avoid the elision, to alter the first line of Luther's great hymn to Ein starker Schutz. This movement was inaugurated by Justinus Grimmius in his hymnological collection (1847). The better taste of the early part of the present century demanded the restoration of hymns to their original form. In this direction Bunsen, Stier, Daniel, Knapp, and others did good service by their hymnological collections.

Many fine hymns have been added during the present century to the already rich and well-filled stores of Germany. Arndt (d. 1860), Friedrich Rückert (d. 1867), Meta Hauser (d. 1876), a Swiss poetess, and others, have made their offerings. But the two most copious contributors have been Spitta (d. 1859) and Albert Knapp (d. 1864). The former's Psalter und Harfe ("Psalter and Harp"), a collection of sacred lyrics, had a very wide circulation, and contains some very fine hymns. One of his best is Alles schwindet; Herzen brechen ("All is dying, hearts are breaking").

Many fine hymns have been added during the present century to the already rich and well-filled stores of Germany. Arndt (d. 1860), Friedrich Rückert (d. 1867), Meta Hauser (d. 1876), a Swiss poetess, and others, have made their offerings. But the two most copious contributors have been Spitta (d. 1859) and Albert Knapp (d. 1864). The former's Psalter und Harfe ("Psalter and Harp"), a collection of sacred lyrics, had a very wide circulation, and contains some very fine hymns. One of his best is Alles schwindet; Herzen brechen ("All is dying, hearts are breaking").

The first living hymnist of Germany is Prälart Karl Gerok, formerly court preacher to the king of Württemberg, and author of some choice collections of sacred lyrics.

One of the best of them is Eines will ich mir vor allem andern ("More than all, one thing my heart is craving"). The first living hymnist of Germany is Prälat Karl Gerok, formerly court preacher to the king of Württemberg, and author of some choice collections of sacred lyrics.

The best of them is Eines will ich mir vor allem andern ("More than all, one thing my heart is craving"). The first living hymnist of Germany is Prälat Karl Gerok, formerly court preacher to the king of Württemberg, and author of some choice collections of sacred lyrics.

The best of them is Eines will ich mir vor allem andern ("More than all, one thing my heart is craving"). The first living hymnist of Germany is Prälat Karl Gerok, formerly court preacher to the king of Württemberg, and author of some choice collections of sacred lyrics.

One of the best of them is Eines will ich mir vor allem andern ("More than all, one thing my heart is craving"). The first living hymnist of Germany is Prälat Karl Gerok, formerly court preacher to the king of Württemberg, and author of some choice collections of sacred lyrics.

One of the best of them is Eines will ich mir vor allem andern ("More than all, one thing my heart is craving"). The first living hymnist of Germany is Prälat Karl Gerok, formerly court preacher to the king of Württemberg, and author of some choice collections of sacred lyrics.
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French Hymns. — Calvin, like Luther, advocated congregational singing; and quite recently a hymn by him was found in an old Geneuese prayer-book. It was printed in 1568. The opening line is: "Te sure, mon dieu, la mort, / merci, je Te salue, mon Dieu, / mon dieu, la mort," etc. (I greet Thee, my sure Redeemer art.) See Christ in Song, p. 549. While Calvin was at Strassburg he came into possession of some of Clement Marot's versions of the Psalms without knowing they were his, and had them set to music. These with five original versions of Ps. xxv., xxxvi., xlv., xxxviii., the Apostles' Creed, and the Song of Simeon, and the Decalogue in verse (by his own hand), he published at Strassburg, 1539, under the title Aulcums Pseaulmes et Cantiques mys en chant. This book, consisting of twenty-one pieces, with the tune at the beginning of each psalm, but without preface or the name of the author, was the first collection of psalms in the French Reformed Church. Marot (d. at Turin, 1544) in 1541 received permission to publish the Trente Pseaulmes ("Thirty Psalms"), which appeared the following year with a dedication to Charles V. In 1548 he published Cinquantps Pseaulmes ("Fifty Psalms"). After Marot's death, Beza added translations of other psalms; but it was not till 1562 that a complete collection of the whole Psalter appeared. Marot's versions are felicitous, and with few changes continue to be sung to the present day in the French churches. Claude Goudin set them to music.

The hymnology of the French churches is meagre. To César Malan (d. 1864), according to Vinet, belongs the honor of restoring the hymn to them. In connection with Bost (d. 1674) he published in 1629 a collection of French hymns, under the title Chants de Siène, which appeared in an improved form in 1641, under the title Chants Chrétiens. Malan wrote more than a thousand hymns. The hymn for the dying, Non, ce n'est pas mourir ("No, no, it is not dying"), is familiar to English ears. The Chants chrétiens has incorporated many hymns from Roman-Catholic writers, as Bishop Godeau (d. 1672), who published a collection of elegant translations of the Psalms (Les psaumes de David traduits en vers français), Cornelle (d. 1684), Racine (d. 1699), Madame Guyon (d. 1717), and others. Madame Guyon's hymns are distinguished by graceful composition and devotional fervor. A number of them were translated by Cowper, who could fully sympathize with the mystical temper of their author, and some are found in English hymn-books.


D. S. SCHAFF

HYMNOLOGY, English and American. Notwithstanding the great antiquity of religious poetry, English hymnology is one of the latest fruits of the English mind. A hymn is defined in the Oxford Dictionary as a sacred or Christian song of praise to God; but this would include psalms, which are now distinguished from hymns proper. The word "psalm" does not differ materially in its etymological signification from the word "hymn," each meaning "a sacred song or hymn." But by a psalm, as here used, one of the Psalms of David, or a version of one; while a Christian hymn is a song of praise to God, generally based upon some thought or form of words found in the Bible. The propriety of using in Christian worship any metrical compositions except versions of the Psalms of David, was not readily conceded by our conservative forefathers; and a century, almost, had elapsed after the Reformation before hymns were looked upon with favor.

By far the greatest portion of the most ancient English literature was founded upon the Bible, and at a very early date large portions of the Scriptures were put into a metrical form. There is no evidence that these compositions were intended to be used in worship, though as late as the reign of Edward VI. it was contended that all Scripture should be versified and sung; and the first fourteen chapters of the Acts of the Apostles were actually so used in the royal chapel, and the Books of Genesis and Kings were done into metre with a like intent.

In the same reign a zealous reformer, Thomas Sternhold, who had been groom of the robes to Henry VIII., and held the same office under Edward, "became so scandalized at the amorous and obscene songs used in the court, that he, forsooth, turned into English metre fifty-one of David's Psalms, and caused musical notes to be set to them, thinking thereby that the courtiers would sing them, instead of their sonnets; but they did not, only some few excepted" (Wood: Athenae Oxoniensi).

This was the beginning of the version of the Psalms still known under the names of Sternhold and Hopkins. The first edition (1548 or 1549) comprised but nineteen psalms; but others were added in successive editions, until in 1562 all the Psalms had been translated, and annexed to the prayer-book.

The year after this publication, Sir Philip Sidney was born. His name is associated with a metrical version of the Psalms made in connection with his sister, the Countess of Pembroke; but it remained in manuscript until the present century. The version of Sternhold and Hopkins stood the test of use for nearly a hundred years: but, at about the middle of the seventeenth century, complaint was made of its "obsoleteness;" and in 1640 there appeared a new version, printed under authority of the House of Commons, by Francis Rous, a member of Parliament, who afterwards became one of Cromwell's privy council, and was privileged to sit in the Westminster Assembly among the few laymen there.

A half-century later the version of Tate and Brady appeared. In the mean time a number of singers had enriched the religious literature of our tongue. Herbert and Vaughan, Southwell and Milton, Jeremy Taylor, and Richard Baxter, all wrote elevating poetry, which has not yet lost its power to lift up the spiritual mind; but their productions can hardly be called hymns. In 1663 John Mason, grandson of the author of the Treatise on Self-knowledge, published thirty-three Songs of Praise, which obtained some popularity, and were, perhaps, the first hymns actually used in public worship. That none of these writers
had succeeded in firmly establishing this use of hymns is evident from the fact, that, when Isaac Watts presented his hymns to the public, he contrived into a long prefatory argument, as a "bold and determined innovator," in favor of the right to found hymns on "any portion" of Scripture. The practice of doing this was, however, an ancient one. The old Latin and Greek hymns, largely produced during the so-called "dark ages," have of late come back into use, to the great enrichment of our collections; and they, we know, were used in public worship. Still, so strong was the attachment of the people to psalmody, that they were unwilling to countenance the use of words, though expressing scriptural thoughts and aspirations, which were not also of the Jewish temple.

To Watts — the orthodox disserter, though overflowing with Christian love for members of all denominations — it was given substantially to create English hymnology. Bishop Ken had preceded him, and had fixed his Doxology in English hymn-books forever; the persecuted Romanist, John Austin, had given the church the hymn, Hark, my Soul, how Every thing; Joseph Addison had written, The Spacious Firmament on high, and other hymns now found in our hymnals; and John Byrom had written his then unpublished hymns: but none of these had made any determined attempt to supersede the Psalter. English hymnology may, therefore, be said to have begun in the year 1707, when Isaac Watts published his first hymns,—hymns that were so much superior to all that had gone before them as to force their way into acceptance, and to live to the present day among those most loved and most often used.

Watts was followed by imitators, many of whom produced hymns that are still found in all collections. Among these were Simon Browne, who wrote Come, Holy Spirit, Heavenly Dove; Thomas Gibbons, author of Now let our Souls, on Wings sublime; Benjamin Beddome, who wrote Did Christ o'er Sinners weep? John Fawcett, author of Blest be the Tie that binds; Thomas Haweis, author of From the Cross uplifted high; Thomas Stenning, who wrote Majestic Sweetness sits Enthroned; Thomas Scott, author of Angels, roll thy Way, and others.

Before the peaceful life of Dr. Watts had closed, the next great leader in English hymnology had arisen. He was an outgrowth of the stirring scenes in the midst of which grew up the Wesleyan body. There had been meetings at Oxford in 1729, meetings in Savannah (Ga.) in 1736, and in 1739 the formation of the United Society of Methodists. There had been spiritual struggles, opposition to the apathy that the members of the new reform saw in the Established Church, protestations of a manly life which marked the times; and the new hymnology reflected all of it. A body of Christians so enthusiastic as the early Methodists could not live without the service of song, and they needed more stirring lyrics than those of Watts and his school. The demand insured the supply. All of the Wesleyan body contributed to the advancement of feeling; but the singer among them was Charles, who produced seven thousand hymns.

The first were published in 1739, and the last after the writer's death. They illustrate his experience, and for that reason appeal to all hearts. The hymn Glory to God, and Praise and Love (usually beginning "Oh for a thousand tongues to sing") was written in commemoration of Wesley's "witness of adoption," which occurred, he states, on Whit Sunday, May 21, 1737. Among Charles Wesley's hymns are, Come, Thou Almighty King; Hark, how all the Welkin rings! how God of Glorious Majesty (usually beginning "Lo, on a narrow neck of land"); Love Divine all Love excelling; Blow ye the Trumpet, blow; and Jesus, Lover of my Soul.

Wesley was followed by Thomas Olivers, author of The God of Abraham praise; John Cennick, who wrote Children of the Heavenly King; Augustus Montague Toplady, the doctrinal opponent, though the poetical child, of Wesley, who wrote A Living and Dying Prayer for the Holiest Believer in the World (which begins "Rock of Ages, cleft for me"); and Your Harps, ye Trembling Saints.

Among the hymn-writers who followed, before the present century, were William Hammond (Awake, and sing the Song of Moses and the Lamb), Joseph Hart (Come, ye Sinners, Poor and Wretched), William Cowper (What Various Hindrances we meet), Samuel Medley (Mortals, awake, with Angels join), William Williams (Guide me, O thou Great Jehovah), John Ryland (Sovereign Ruler of the Skies), Joseph Griggs (Behold! a Stranger's seat Enstowed), Stennett, who wrote Majestic Sweetness sits Enthroned of The God of Abraham praise; John Cennick, who wrote Children of the Heavenly King; Augustus Montague Toplady, the doctrinal opponent, though the poetical child, of Wesley, who wrote A Living and Dying Prayer for the Holiest Believer in the World (which begins "Rock of Ages, cleft for me"); and Your Harps, ye Trembling Saints.

Wesley was followed by Thomas Olivers, author of The God of Abraham praise; John Cennick, who wrote Children of the Heavenly King; Augustus Montague Toplady, the doctrinal opponent, though the poetical child, of Wesley, who wrote A Living and Dying Prayer for the Holiest Believer in the World (which begins "Rock of Ages, cleft for me"); and Your Harps, ye Trembling Saints.

Among the hymn-writers who followed, before the present century, were William Hammond (Awake, and sing the Song of Moses and the Lamb), Joseph Hart (Come, ye Sinners, Poor and Wretched), William Cowper (What Various Hindrances we meet), Samuel Medley (Mortals, awake, with Angels join), William Williams (Guide me, O thou Great Jehovah), John Ryland (Sovereign Ruler of the Skies), Joseph Griggs (Behold! a Stranger's seat Enstowed), Stennett, who wrote Majestic Sweetness sits Enthroned of The God of Abraham praise; John Cennick, who wrote Children of the Heavenly King; Augustus Montague Toplady, the doctrinal opponent, though the poetical child, of Wesley, who wrote A Living and Dying Prayer for the Holiest Believer in the World (which begins "Rock of Ages, cleft for me"); and Your Harps, ye Trembling Saints.

Wesley was followed by Thomas Olivers, author of The God of Abraham praise; John Cennick, who wrote Children of the Heavenly King; Augustus Montague Toplady, the doctrinal opponent, though the poetical child, of Wesley, who wrote A Living and Dying Prayer for the Holiest Believer in the World (which begins "Rock of Ages, cleft for me"); and Your Harps, ye Trembling Saints.

Among the hymn-writers who followed, before the present century, were William Hammond (Awake, and sing the Song of Moses and the Lamb), Joseph Hart (Come, ye Sinners, Poor and Wretched), William Cowper (What Various Hindrances we meet), Samuel Medley (Mortals, awake, with Angels join), William Williams (Guide me, O thou Great Jehovah), John Ryland (Sovereign Ruler of the Skies), Joseph Griggs (Behold! a Stranger's seat Enstowed), Stennett, who wrote Majestic Sweetness sits Enthroned of The God of Abraham praise; John Cennick, who wrote Children of the Heavenly King; Augustus Montague Toplady, the doctrinal opponent, though the poetical child, of Wesley, who wrote A Living and Dying Prayer for the Holiest Believer in the World (which begins "Rock of Ages, cleft for me"); and Your Harps, ye Trembling Saints.
this period is John Newton, whose remarkable experience was much more phenomenal than that of White, and has left its mark on his hymns. Among his productions that are well known are, *By Faith in Christ I walk with God; One there is above all Others; How Sweet the Name of Jesus sounds! Safely through another Week; Amazing Grace, how Sweet the Sound! Come, my Soul, thy Suit prepare; Approach, my Soul, the Mercy-seat; and Glorious Things of thee are spoken, Zion, City of our God.* Few hymns are more explicitly records of experience (and the writer said plainly that they were such) than those of Newton.

English hymnology has been enriched during the present century from two chief sources besides natural growth. The so-called "Oxford" movement, and the contributions of writers belonging, like Edward Caswall, J. H. Newman, and Frederick W. Faber, to the Roman-Catholic communion, have given us many hymns that are accepted by Christians of every name as true outpourings of the pious heart. John Keble, the poetical leader in the Oxford movement, published in 1827 the most extensively circulated book of religious poetry of modern times,—*The Christian Year.* J. H. Newman wrote, *Lead, Kindly Light.* John Mason Neale, a practical communionist and philanthropist, as well as a scholar and a poet, opened to modern Christians the wealth of mediæval Greek and Latin hymnology, and enriched our collections with such translations as *Fierce Light.* John S. B. Monsell, the author of some of the best hymns of our day, has in England, chiefly, perhaps, because we have had the riches of the mother-country to make choice from, and needed only such lyrics as a few different circumstances rendered necessary; still, American poets have made considerable contributions to this department of letters. Timothy Dwight (1799-1859) wrote *Softly now the Light of Day.* Bishop Henry L. Mead (1824-71) wrote *The Spirit in our Hearts,* and Bishop Edward Hamilton Dole (1824-61) wrote *Like Noah’s Weary Dove,* and *I would not live alway.* The poetical productions of the Moravians, James Montgomery, was one of the early hymn-writers of the century; and, though he was a poet of but mediocre talent, he has fixed his name in the collections by certain hymns, among which are *God is Love, is Mercy brightens: Above all Others; How Sweet the Name of Jesus sounds! Safely through another Week; Amazing Grace, how Sweet the Sound! Come, my Soul, thy Suit prepare; Approach, my Soul, the Mercy-seat; and Glorious Things of thee are spoken, Zion, City of our God.* Few hymns are more explicitly records of experience (and the writer said plainly that they were such) than those of Newton.
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The progress of English hymnology has been from rugged style and gross conceptions to elegance and strength of style, and spirituality of conception. The hymns of the present day are...
HYPOSTASIS, a religious sect living in Cappadocia in the fourth century. It was a singular mixture of Paganism and Judaism. It retained the worship of the Sun and Light, but rejected all image-worship. It retained the Sabbath, the regulations of diet, etc., but rejected the circumcision. All we know of this sect is derived from Gregory Nazianzen (Orat., xviii. 5), who belonged to it before his conversion to Christianity, and Gregory of Nyssa (Adv. Eunomium, 2, 2). See ULLMANN: De Hyp., Heidelberg, 1888; and BÜHMER: De Hyp., Berlin, 1834.

HYRCANUS I, John, a member of the Asmoncean family; king and high priest of the Jews; d. 105 B.C. He was a son of Simon Maccabeus, and, at the murder of his father and two brothers, fell heir to the two highest dignities of his nation (135 B.C.). The same Ptolemy who had murdered his father intended to put him out of the way likewise; but Hyrcanus escaped, and afterwards established himself firmly in the possession of his power by arms against Ptolemy, and by a tribute of five hundred talents to Antiochus VII. After the latter's death (128 B.C.) he extended his kingdom over Samaria and Idumea, and strengthened his throne by a treaty with the Romans.

In the latter part of his reign the antagonism between the Pharisees and Sadducees began to show itself. Hyrcanus followed the traditions of his house, and favored the former party (Joseph., Antiq., xiii. 10, 5), until they clamored for his resignation of the high priestly office, when he went over to the Sadducees. Schürer says of his reign, that "it was the most glorious Israel had seen since the days of Solomon." See WERNER: Johann Hyrkan, Worms, 1877; SCHÜLER: N. T. Richte Zeitgeschichte, pp. 107—117, Leipzig, 1874; EWALD: History of Israel, vol. iv.; STANLEY: History of the Jewish Church, iii.

HYRCANUS II, grandson of Hyrcanus I., and high priest of the Jews; was executed 30 B.C. He was a weak character, easily deceived, and the dupe or tool of others for forty years. At the death of his mother Alexandra (69 B.C.), who had succeeded to the throne at her husband's death (78 B.C.), his younger brother disputed his rightful accession to power by arms, defeated him, and forced him not only to renounce his power, but to resign the high priestly office, which he was put into confinement. He then fled to Rome, where he was received by Caligula, and was allowed to return to Jerusalem in 36 B.C., at the death of his mother Alexandra. He was put to death by Herod the Great, who had married his beautiful daughter Mariamne. He sought his favor, and the year following was restored by him to the high priesthood. In this office he was confirmed by Caesar (47 B.C.), and received a nominal civil jurisdiction at the side of Antipater, the procurator of Judea. When the Parthians overran the land, and plundered Jerusalem (40 B.C.), he was put into prison, cut off his ears in order to unfit him forever for the high priesthood, placed his son Antigonus in that office, and took him into captivity. He returned to Jerusalem in 38 B.C., but was put to death by Herod the Great, who had married his beautiful daughter Mariamne. He remained in prison to avoid the possibility of his royal claims being recognized by the Romans, and to annihilate the influence of the name "Asmonæan" upon the
HYSTASPES, or HYDASPES. Among the Christians of the first century, there circulated a prophetico-apocalyptic book, pretending to be the work of the Persian or Median wise man and king, Hystaspes, and to contain prophecies of Christ and his kingdom. It was one of those pseudepigraphous compositions which at that time were made in great number, and of various forms, for apologetic purposes. Generally they were ascribed to some person of the old covenant; but, as soon as Christianity penetrated into the Pagan world, the attempt was made, not only to interpret real dicta of elder Pagan seers and poets with a Christian intention, but also to manufacture heathen prophecies of Christianity. The most remarkable productions of this kind were the so-called "Sibylline books," much used by the apologists and fathers from the second to the fourth century; and they found their Oriental counterpart in the Vaticinia Hystaspis.

The book is spoken of by three of the fathers, — Justin (Apolog., i. 20 and 44), Clement of Alexandria (Strom., v. 6, § 43), and Lactantius (Instit. div., vii. 15, 18; Epitom., T. ii. p. 69). Of the author, Justin and Clement say nothing; but Lactantius adds that he was an ancient Median king, living before the Trojan war. In spite of the chronological confusion, it is probable that Lactantius here thinks of the father of King Darius I., of whom Ammianus Marcellinus (xxii. 8) tells us that he had learnt much wisdom and many secret arts from the Brahmins of India, and again taught them to the magians. Cyathius, a Byzantine historian from the sixth century, speaks (Hist., ii. 24) of a Hystaspes, a contemporary of Zoroaster, without deciding whether or not he was identical with the father of Darius. It is evident that we here meet with traces of the Persian myths about the Bactrian king Vistaspa, or Gustasp, a contemporary of Zoroaster; and we may safely assume that the Vaticinia Hystaspis were founded on Persian reminiscences, though the scanty notices of the book which have come down to us do not allow us to form any explicit opinion of its form, contents, or tendency.

IBAS succeeded Rabulas as bishop of Edessa in 435, though he had previously opposed him very strenuously in his endeavors to have the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia condemned as heretical. But when he undertook, in connection with two other residents of Edessa (Cumas and Probus), to translate these writings into Syriac, he was accused, before the patriarch Proclus and Emperor Theodosius II., of propagating the Nestorian heresies, and was deposed by the Robber Synod of Ephesus, Aug. 22, 449. He was reinstated, however, by the synod of Chalcedon (451), and died Oct. 28, 457. Parts of his epistle to Mares of Beth-Hardashir (Seleucia) on the Tigris, of great interest as an authentic document from the very time of the Nestorian controversy, have been preserved in a Greek translation among the acts of the Council of Chalcedon, and are found in MANSI: Concil., VII. He is not recognized by the Jacobites. See ASSEMAN: Bib. Orient., I, p. 200.

IBN EZRA. See ABEN EZRA.

ICELAND, an island belonging to Denmark, situated in the North Atlantic Ocean, just south of the polar circle, 130 miles south-east of Greenland, and 450 miles west of Norway, comprises an area of 39,200 square miles, with about 70,000 inhabitants. In the latter part of the eighth century the country was visited by Celtic monks. The settlers were Pagans; but, through their intercourse with the mother-country, they became acquainted with Christianity during the tenth century, and in 1000 Christianity was officially established as the religion of the country. In 1035 an episcopal see was founded at Skalholt, and in 1106 another at Holar. The tithe was introduced in 1090, and an ecclesiastical code promulgated in 1125. The country belonged first to the archiepiscopal see of Hamburg-Bremen, then to that of Lund (1106), and finally to that of Nidaros (1237); but the connection was rather loose, as the bishops were elected by the people. In 1550 the Reformation was introduced with armed force by the Danish king, though without effecting any great change in the religious state of the people. In 1801 the bishopric of Holar was abolished, and in 1825 the whole island was made under the authority of the episcopal see of Rejkjavick. See G. J. THORKELIN: Jus ecclesiasticum, etc., Copenhagen, 1778; HAN-CHOW: Om Reformationen i Island, Copenhagen, 1843.

ICHTHYS (Greek ἵχθυς, "a fish;" the acrostic of the sentence Ιησοῦς Χριστός, Θεός Τεός, Σωτήρ, "Jesus Christ, God's Son, Saviour") forms one of the earliest and most frequently used Christian symbols. The name "ichthys," or the picture of a fish, is often found engraved on sarcophagi, crosses, altars, tombstones, etc.; and numerous metaphorical expressions or elaborate allegories in the writings of the Fathers were occasioned by this acrostic. Clement of Alexandria (Paedag., III. 11) mentions the fish as one of the Christian symbols, though without making any allusion to its origin. The first who, in speaking of the symbol, also thinks of the acrostic, is Tertullian (De Baptismo, I.). See F. BECKER: D. Darstellung J. C. unter d. Bliite d. Fisches, Leipzig, 1806, 2d ed., 1876.

ICONIUM, the present Konysch, a city of Asia Minor, at the foot of Mount Taurus, on the road from Antioch in Pisidia to Derbe, was at one time the capital of Lycaonia, and through many centuries a flourishing place. Paul visited it three times (Acts xiii. 51, xiv. 19, 21, xvi. 2), and it is the scene of the legend of Paul and Thecla.

ICONOCLAST, "image-breaker," and ICONODULIST, "image-server" (from εἰκών, "an image," and κλώσω, "to break," or δολεῖσθω, "to serve"), are the Greek names of the two opposite parties in the great controversy concerning Image-worship; which article see. In modern usage, the word "iconoclast" is applied to one who destroys shams or impositions of any kind.

ICONOSTASIS, a piece of furniture in the Eastern Church, corresponding, not to our rood-screen, which separates the choir from the nave, but to our altar-rails, forming a holiest of the holy. It developed, indeed, from the simple, open altar-rails which were in use in the Christian churches from the earliest date, into a solid panel, completely concealing the altar by degrees, as the service in the Greek Church assumed the character of a great liturgical drama. Its name it received from its being highly ornamented with pictures (εἰκών), and it probably reached its present form in the eighth century.

IDOL and IDOLATRY. In classical Greek the word εἰκών is used of any kind of representation, bodily or ideal, pictorial, sculptural, or mimical; and it has no reference at all to the question whether the representation is to be recognized as an object of worship, or simply looked at as a product of art. The idea of an idol did not exist in the Greek civilization. It originated among the Jews, under the first covenant: and, though the Septuagint uses εἰκών to translate no less than sixteen different Hebrew words, it applies it, nevertheless, exclusively to such representations as are destined for worship, leaving entirely out of consideration whether the subject of the representation be the true God or a false one; as, according to the Second Commandment, any bodily representation of any deity, when worshipped, is an idol.

The word εἰκοσολαρπεία is of Christian origin, and occurs for the first time in the writings of the New Testament (1 Cor. x. 14; Gal. v. 20; 1 Pet. iv. 3; Col. iii. 5). As at the time of Christ the Jews had ceased long ago to use any bodily representation of God in their service, while all the pagan religions found within the boundaries of the Roman Empire worshipped their gods under some kind of bodily representation, it was quite natural that the apostolic writers, and after them the Fathers, should apply
IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH.

IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH. The only sources from which any information can be drawn about this celebrated person are the epistles circulating under his name. Eusebius knows nothing more of him than what can be extracted from the epistles, with the exception of a few short notices by Irenæus (Adv. Haeres., V. 28, 4) and by Origen (prologue to the Canticles, and in Hom. 6, on Luke), which he also knows. But the list he gives of the bishops of Antioch is doubtful with respect to its chronology. Compare A. Harnack: Die Zeit des Ignatius, Leipzig, 1878. He places Ignatius as the second bishop after Peter. As nobody knew anything about the intervening Euodius, he gradually dropped out of attention, and a new tradition formed, placing Ignatius immediately after Peter (Chrysostom, the Paschal Chronicle, Theodoret). Between these two traditions the Const. Ap. (VII. 46) tries to mediate by making Peter consecrate, first Euodius, and then Ignatius. What tradition else has preserved concerning Ignatius — the story that he was the child spoken of in Matt. xviii. 5, and other fictions by Simeon Metaphrastes and Vincentius — is completely worthless. Nor are the various Acta Martyr of any historical value. We have two which are completely independent of each other. 1. Martyrium Coluriurum, first published by Ussher, 1647, in a barbarous but literal translation, then in a Greek version by Ruinart in Act. Mart., 1689, and finally in a Syriac translation by Mosinger, in Suppl. Corp. Ign., Innsbruck, 1872. 2. Martyrium Vaticanum, edited by Dressel, in Patr. Apost., p. 308. The Latin Vita Ignatii, in Act. Sact. Feb., I., 29, the Armenian Martyrium, edited by Petermann, and the Vita, by Symeon Metaphrastes, may be considered as mere compilations from the two first mentioned. This whole literature has been collected and edited by Zahn, in Patr. Ap. Oper., Leipzig, 1870 (F. X. Funk, Op. Patr. Ap., Tübingen, 1881, and J. B. Lightfoot, London, 1885). But all these Acta Martyr are spurious: they contradict the epistles; they swarm with unhistorical statements; they were not known to any old writer, not even to Eusebius; they date, probably, from the fifth century. Thus the epistles are the only source of information left to us. They claim to have been written by Ignatius, on his journey from Antioch (where he had been condemned to death) to Rome, where he was to suffer the punishment of being torn to pieces by wild beasts.

The total number of epistles bearing the name of Ignatius is fifteen, but they are of very different date and worth. Seven of them, namely, those Ad Ephesios, Magnesios, Trallianos, Romanos, Philadelphos, Smyrnios, and Polycarpum, are extant in a double Greek version,—a shorter and a longer. The latter contains five more epistles: namely, those Ad S. Joannem, Tarsens, Antiochenos, Heronem, and Philippum. And finally we have three more epistles, but only in a Latin translation; namely, two Ad S. Joannem, and one Ad S. Mariam Virginem, to which is added a Responsio B. Mariae V. ad Ignatium. The three last-mentioned letters were probably originally written in Latin, and then translated into Greek. Two of them are worthless. They are found in Zahn l. c. of the shorter Greek version, G1, we have two manuscripts,—Codex Medico-Laurentianus, and Codex Casanatensis, of which, however, the latter is a transcription of the former. There also exist a Latin translation, first published by Ussher, 1644, a Syriac translation, extant only in fragments, and a complete Armenian translation of the Syriac translation, published by the Armenian Bishop Menas of Constantinople, 1783. The epistle Ad Romanos is also found in the Codex Colbertinus, and has been published by Mössinger l. c. The whole shorter version was first published by Ussher in Latin, 1644, and then in Greek by Isaac Vossius. Later editions are very numerous, the best by Zahn l. c. Of the longer Greek version, G2, containing twelve epistles, there exist nine manuscripts, and a Latin translation. The above-mentioned Armenian translation also contains the five additional epistles of the longer version. The whole longer version was first edited by Paceus, 1557, then by And. Gessner, 1559, and afterwards often, best by Zahn l. c. Lately the three epistles Ad Ephesios, Smyrnios, and Polycarpum, have been discovered in a version still shorter than G2. This version, however, exists only in a Syriac translation. It has been published by Cureton, The Ancient Syriac Version of the Epistles of S. Ignatius, London, 1845, and still better in Corpus Ignatianum, Berlin, 1846. A very rich collection of materials belonging to the subject, especially of Oriental versions, is found in Petermann: S. Ignatii Epistolae, Leipzig, 1849.

On account of the great importance which the epistles of Ignatius have for the older church history, the question about their genuineness gave rise to a very lively debate; the more as a preliminary question about the authenticity of the versions had to be settled in advance. The history of the debate falls into three periods. The first period ends with the discovery of the shorter version, G1; and its principal result was the general recognition of the spuriousness of those three epistles Ad S. Joannem and S. Mariam Virginem, which exist only in a Latin translation: even Baronius gave them up. With respect to the remaining twelve epistles, most Roman-Catholic theologians (Hartung, Baronius, Bellarmine) accepted them; while most Protestant theologians (e. g., the Magdeburg Centuries, Calvin) rejected them. Among the former, however, Martialis Mastræus acknowledged that the text was interpolated; and among the latter Nic. Vedulaus recognized the only seven epistles mentioned by Eusebius. With the publication of the shorter version, G1, the second period opens. The older version G2 was soon generally rejected as spurious, and the version G2 rejected as interpolated: and lately Zahn has fixed the date of this inter-
polation to the latter half of the second century (Ignatius von Antiochien, Gotha, 1873). The question of the authenticity of the text thus settled, the question of the author was again taken up. The five epistles not mentioned by Eusebius, and not contained in the shorter version (Ad Mariam Cassabollitam, Tarsenses, Antiochenos, Heremon, and Philippenses), were immediately excluded as spurious. With respect to the remaining seven epistles, the question was answered in the affirmative by Rohde, Huther, Distlerdieck, and others; in the negative, especially by Baur, who fixes their date at the middle of the second century. The third period begins with the discovery of the shortest Syrian version, S, of the three epistles Ad Romans, Ephesios, and Polycarpum. Cureton, who first edited this version, asserted without hesitation that the original and genuine epistles of Ignatius had now been found; that the versions G1 and G2 were nothing but interpolations and expansions in support of a later state of ecclesiastical development; that the four epistles Ad Magnesios, Smyrneos, Philadelphiensis, and Trallianos, were fictitious compositions, etc. Bunsen exerted himself much to introduce these views in Germany (Drei echten u. vier unechten Briefe d. Ignatius, Hamburg, 1847, and Ignatius von Antiochien u. s. Zeit, Hamburg, 1847). They found also many adherents (Ritschel, Weiss, Bühringer, and Lipsius); but they met with still stronger opposition, both among those who rejected the Ignatian epistles in any version, such as Baur (Die ignatianischen Briefe und ihr neuester Kritiker, Tübingen, 1849), and among those who accepted them in version G1, such as Denzing (Über d. Aehheit d. bisherigen Textes d. ignatianischen Briefe, Würzburg, 1849), Uhlhorn (Zeitschrift f. d. hist. Theol., 1855, I.-II.), Petermann, Merx (Meletenata Ignatiana, 1861), and Zahn. In the course of the debate, conclusive evidence was produced, partly from a logical analysis of the contents of the epistles, partly from a comparison of the various Syrian translations, that S is nothing more than an extract from G1. Some of the staunchest champions of S, as, for instance, Lepsius and Lightfoot, fell off; and the whole period passed off as an episode, leaving the debate at the old dilemma: either we have the genuine epistles of Ignatius in the version G1, or we have no epistles at all by Ignatius, but only spurious compositions bearing his name.

A decision in the matter has not yet been reached, though it may not be so very far off. The objections to the genuineness of the epistles are: (1) That the fact on which they rest is unhistorical. When, however, the fact is read out of the epistles themselves, and not, as Baur did, out of the spurious Acta Martyrum, it fits in very well with the actual state of affairs. That Christians suffered martyrdom under Trajan is well known; and it need cause no hesitation that Ignatius was among them. (2) That the governor of Antioch, as instances of such condemnations occur even in Hermas, and soon after become very frequent. Nor is it strange that he should be brought to Rome to be executed. The law forbidding the governor to send convicts from one province to another dates from the time of Constantine, and soon after their transferrence of such prisoners to Rome is still later. The route of the journey has nothing improbable about it, as little as the circumstance, that, on the road, Ignatius was at liberty to converse with the congregations, and write letters. Similar instances occur in Lucian (De morte pergini), and in the acts of Perpetua and Felicitas. The whole situation, finally, presupposed by the Epistle Ad Romans, the anxiety of Ignatius that the Romans might take some step in order to secure his liberation, is easily explained by the legal right which any one concerned had to appeal in behalf of another, even against his will. (2) When next it has been said (by Baur) that the character of Ignatius, such as it appears in the epistles, looks more like a fiction than a reality, that his forced humility and strained heroism are downright offensive, etc., the mere subjectivity of this objection, and consequently its insufficiency as an argument, is proved by the circumstance that others (e.g., Rohde) find a strong evidence of the genuineness of the epistles in the picture they give of the character of Ignatius. (3) Of much more weight is the objection that the heresies attacked in the epistles belong to a later period than the beginning of the second century. It has been doubted whether the epistles speak of two distinct heresies,—a gnostico-docetic and a judaizing,—or only of one, combining both these elements; and it has been asserted that such a combination would be an impossibility. But we know too little of the earlier stages of Gnosticism to make such an assertion; and a cautious criticism must, no doubt, arrive at the conclusion that the epistles were written before Gnosticism reached that form under which it presents itself between 130 and 140. A decision with respect to the genuineness of the epistles cannot be reached from this point; and, should from some other point an irrefragable evidence of their genuineness be produced, we would have to change our ideas of the historical development of Gnosticism. (4) It has also been alleged that the church constitution mirrored by the epistles, especially the episcopacy, belongs to a later time. It is true that the epistles distinguish sharply between the bishop, the presbyter, and the deacon; that they represent the episcopate as superior to the presbyter; that they never weary of extolling the bishop, and extolling the faithful to rally around him as the visible representative of the unity of the congregation, etc. But, though the epistles doubtless show an advance beyond Clemens Romanus and Hermas, they certainly fall behind Ireneus. Ignatius knows nothing about an apostolic establishment of the episcopate, nor does he connect with it those ideas of a priesthood which afterwards were borrowed from the Old Testament. The episcopate is to him an office in the congregation, not an office in the church. The bishop is to him not the successor of the apostles, nor is he the bearer of the doctrinal deposit: he unites the whole, though not every difficulty presented by the above objections can be said to have been successfully solved, the collective mass of internal evidence against the genuineness of the epistles would, nevertheless, be insufficient to counterbalance the testimony of internal evidence.
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mony in the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippian.
He who will prove the epistles of Ignatius to be spurious must begin by proving the Epistle of Polycarp to be spurious, or at least very heavily interpolated; but such an undertaking will hardly ever succeed. [Besides the works already mentioned, see J. NIJSCH. Die Theologie des heiligen Ignatius, Mainz, 1850.] G. UHLMANN.

IGNATIUS. Patriarch of Constantinople in 790 or 796; a son of the emperor Michael I.; was seized, mutilated, and shut up in a monastery by the usurper, Leo V., the Armenian, but rose gradually in the service of the Church, and was made Patriarch of Constantinople in 847. He could not agree, however, with the emperor, Michael III.; and by the intrigues of his uncle, Caesar Bardas, he was deposed in 858, and banished to the Island of Terebinthus. Photius was put in his place. But Ignatius could not be made to give up his claims, and thus a schism arose. The Pope, Nicholas I., was called in as a mediator, but he caused the Pope to be rejected, and his verdict was against Photius. Photius, however, succeeded in vindicating himself in the patriarchal chair until 897, when Michael III. was dethroned and murdered by Basilius Macedo. Basilius recalled Ignatius, who remained in possession of his office to his death in (878). Between Ignatius and Adrian II., the successor of Nicholas I., there arose a vehement controversy concerning Bulgaria, which each bishop demanded as belonging to his diocese. See Manus: Concil. Coll. xv., p. 62.

Besides his letters, also a Vita Tarassii by Ignatius has come down to us. See Photius.

IGNATIUS LOYOLA (Don Inigo Lopez de Recalde), b. in the Castle of Loyola, Guipuzcoa, Spain, 1491; d. in Rome, July 31, 1556; was educated at the court of Ferdinand the Catholic, a knight in the full romantic sense of the word. In 1521, when defending the fortress of Pamplona against the French, he received an extremely painful wound in the foot, and was brought to the paternal castle to be nursed. While on his sick-bed, he asked for books; and as his favorite reading, the fantastic and voluptuous romances, swarms of chivalry, could not be procured, he plunged himself in the legends of the Church, the lives of the saints. The effect was most wonderful; a complete conversion, an unquenchable passion. From the sick-bed he immediately repaired to the monastery of Montserrat, hung up his armor before the image of the Virgin, exchanged his gay and splendid attire for the rags of a beggar, and retired to a cavern at Manresa, where he spent some time practising the severest ascetic exercises, but also visited and comforted by glorious visions. At Manresa he drew up the first sketch of his famous Exercitia Spiritualia, which, by the members of the order he founded, is considered a work of divine inspiration. Ignatius had new visions; and on March 1, 1543, he received from Ignatius Loyola, and in his Exercitia Spiritualia that spirit found a most characteristic expression. The book may be described as the personal experience of the author transformed into rules, which the reader must follow in order to reach the same goal as he reached. And what is that goal? To be able, through prayers and fasts, through ascetic and spiritual exercises of the severest description, through absolute seclusion from the world and concentrated meditation, to take an irrevocable vow of obedience,—the obedience of the dead body, which has no will and no motion of its own,—the obedience of the stick, which one may take, or leave standing, just as one pleases. The obedience goes from the members to the general, and from the general to the Pope; and when the Pope says that black is white, and white black, it is the great moral glory of the order that it is able to repeat the lie (Regula ad sentendum cum sociis Ignatii Jesu).

LIT. — Besides the lives of Ignatius found in Act. Sanct., July 31, larger biographies of him have been written by Ribadenzeira, Maffei, and
IGNORANTINES.  


IGNORANTINES (Frères Ignorants, Frères Ignorantins, Frères des écoles chrétiennes) is the name of a number of members of the Society of Jesus. The most probable explanation, the Great and fourteen Spanish churchmen. He entered the monastery of Agli, against his dogmatic and moral system, but probably only in religion, but also in the elements of secular education, and thereby prevent any idea imitable to the Roman Church entering or taking possession of the young mind. It developed a great activity in France, and represented, so to speak, the Jesuits, when (in 1764) that order was banished from the country. In 1790, when the institution was dissolved by the revolutionary government, it numbered no less than a hundred and twenty-one schools and colleges. Its members sought refuge in Italy, and were recalled in 1808 by Napoleon, who acknowledged their usefulness for popular education. [In 1878 they numbered 9,516, teaching in 1,064 public schools and in 388 free schools.]

1. H. S., an inscription dating far back in the history of the Christian Church, but whose interpretation is somewhat doubtful. Some explain it as In Hoc Signo, scilicet, vincis ("with this token thou shalt be victorious"), the words accompanying the vision of the radiant cross appearing to Constantine and his army: others, as Jesus Hominem Salvator ("Jesus, Men's Saviour"), the motto of the Jesuits. The most probable explanation, however, is that which derives the inscription simply from the Greek ἸΗΘΩΣ ("Jesus"), as the transformation of the Ι into the Latin S presents no difficulties. See Annales for the Greek Origin of the Monogram I.H.S., published by the Cambridge Camden Society, London, 1841.

ILDEFONSO, St., b. at Toledo, 607; d. there Jan. 23, 667; was a pupil of Isidore of Sevilla; entered the monastery of Agli, against his father's will; became a monk, and afterwards abbot; founded a nunnery near Toledo, and was made archbishop of his native city in 657. According to the testimony of Julian, his successor, he was a prolific writer, though he left most of his works in an unfinished state. Still extant are Libellus de virginitate S. Maria, first edited by Carranza, 1556, and found in Migne, Bib. Pat., 96, the first impulse to that enthusiastic worship of the Virgin which characterized the early Spanish Church; Annotationes de cognitione baptismi et de itinere deserti (Migne l. c.), a complete dogmatic and moral system, but probably only an imitation of an older Spanish work; two letters (Migne l. c.); and his continuation of Isidore's Etymologiae, often published, with an appendix by Julian, Vita Id. Tolet. (Migne l. c.), and containing the lives of Gregory the Great and fourteen Spanish churchmen. The Adoptionists of the eighth century claimed him as one of their forerunners. His life was written by Carranza (1570), Salazar de Mendoza (1519), Mabillon y Silscur (1727). See also Act. Sancti., Jan. 23; Mabillon: A. S. Ben., ii., iii.; and Florez: España Sagrada, v., 429.

ILLGEN, Christian Friedrich, b. at Chemnitz, Sept. 16, 1758; d. at Leipzig, Nov. 15, 1793. He studied in the University of Leipzig, and was appointed professor there of philosophy in 1818, and of theology in 1823. Besides other works, he wrote Lülius Socius' Leben, Leipzig, 1814, and founded the Historisch-Theol. Gesellschaft in 1814, and the Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des jüdischen Lebens, afterwards continued by Niedner and by Kahnis, and contains many valuable contributions to the clearing up of obscure points of church history.

ILLUMINATI was the name adopted by the members of a secret society of half-political and half-religious character, which was founded May 1, 1776, at Ingolstadt, by Adam Weishaupt, professor in the university. The founder's object was simply to form a tool for the gratification of his own ambition; and the model after which he worked was the Society of Jesus. Aided by the singular passion for secret societies which characterized the rationalism of the eighteenth century, he succeeded in forming classes of novices in Ingolstadt, Freising, Munich, in Tyrol, Westphalia, Saxony; and by means of an inexhaustible talent for charlatanry, and a well-planned system of espionage, he also succeeded in keeping his novices in due submission. But what about the further development and final organization of the society? Weishaupt was near his wit's end, and confessed that he really did not know what to do with his novices, when Baron Adolf von Knigge entered the society in 1780, and brought speed and order in its development. A firm connection was established with the Freemasons of Munich, Freising, Francfort, etc. Three classes were formed,—one of novices or minervals, one of Freemasons or Scotch Knights, and one of the pupils of the small and great Mysteries; and the society spread so widely that even the greatest names in Germany were mentioned as members. But in 1784 Weishaupt and Knigge fell out with each other, both wanting to become the Magus or Rex of the society; and in the same year a decree was issued in Bavaria, forbidding all secret societies. The Illuminati felt safe, possessed as they were of a considerable political, social, and moral power; but they overlooked that the manner in which they wielded that power had already made them many enemies; and in 1785 began a sharp persecution, which, within a year or two, brought the whole institution to collapse. [They do not appear ever to have numbered more than two thousand.] The literature of the affair is enormous. As the principal documents may be considered the writings of Weishaupt: Gesch. d. Verfolgung d. Illuminaten, 1786; Apologie der Illuminaten, 1787; D. verbesserte System, 1787, Kurze Rechtfertigung, 1787, etc.

IMAGE OF GOD. The concept of the Image of God is a fundamental one in the department of Christian anthropology. Man is declared (Gen. i. 26) to have been created in God's image (τοίς, τοίς, d'mulh). There is no other difference between these two terms than the difference between a concrete and abstract designation (comp. Gen. v. 3, ix. 6). The use of different prepositions, however, indicates that the former was inalienable: the latter...
might be lost. The dominion over the creatures which is ascribed to man in Gen. i. 28 is not to be regarded as of the essence of the image of God, but as a consequence of it. In the New Testament, sinful man is on the one hand recognized as still possessing the image of God, as in Luke iii. 38 (where Adam, as the founder of the race, is called the son of God); 1 Cor. xi. 7; Jas. iii. 9, etc.: on the other, he is urged to put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge (Col. iii. 10), righteousness, and holiness (Eph. iv. 24), after the divine image. Christ is the perfect image of God (2 Cor. iv. 4; Col. i. 15) and we become renewed after the image of God when we become conformed to the image of Christ (Rom. viii. 29).

We find a variety of utterances in the fathers on this subject. They agree, however, in ascribing the divine image to qualities differentiating man from the rest of the creation, and define the divine image, we must start from the nature similarity to God, which the Alexandrians and the essential element in the image of God in the totality of God, who created man for communion with spiritual being, a personal soul. Man as a person is the only legitimate image of Christ, as it alone contains the whole Christ, both according to his human and according to his divine nature; that image-worship is forbidden by Scripture (John iv. 24, xx. 29; Deut. v. 8, 9; Rom. i. 23; 2 Cor. v. 7; Rom. x. 17), and by the fathers (Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Eusebius of Cesarea, and others); that, consequently, any one who makes or worships images shall be excomunicated and cursed, etc. All the clergy were compelled to subscribe these decisions, and the monks who refused were persecuted. A conspiracy was suppressed by the emperor with fearful severity: even the Patriarch of Constantinople was decapitated. The popes, however, rejected the canons of 754, and a synod of the Lateran condemned the iconoclasts in 789.

A conspiracy was suppressed by the emperor with fearful severity: even the Patriarch of Constantinople was decapitated. The popes, however, rejected the canons of 754, and a synod of the Lateran condemned the iconoclasts in 789. Under Irene, who after the death of her husband, Leo IV. Chazarus (780), was made regent during the minority of her son (Constantine VI), she, the minority of her son (Constantine VI),:1 Leo IV. Chazarus (780), was made regent during the minority of her son (Constantine VI),:1


[Robert South: Sermon on God's Image in Man].

SCHOERLEIN.

IMAGE-WORSHIP. I. IN THE EASTERN CHURCH.—The greatest difficulties which the Emperor Leo III., the Isaurian (717-741), experienced in his endeavors to make the Church co-extensive with the empire arose from the image-worship, which, since the fifth century, had become general among the Christians. Especially the Mohammedans hated the practice as a Pagan abomination; and Leo himself looked upon it as idolatry. From regard, however, for the Patriarch Germanus, the emperor proceeded with caution in his attempt to destroy it. The edict of 726 simply forbade proscription before the images, and ordered them to be hung so high on the walls that people could not reach and kiss them. But to some bishops this manner of proceeding was too slow: on their own account they removed the images from the churches. A great fermentation immediately took place, and dangerous riots occurred in various places. Pope Gregory II. and John of Damascus, the most celebrated theologian of the Greek Church, declared against the emperor, and in favor of the icons, which had received the patroitic blessing. An edict of 730 ordered all images to be removed from the churches, or painted over. The refractory patriarchy was deposed; and, as an answer to the synod which Gregory III. convened against the iconoclasts, the papal revenues from Sicily and Calabria were confiscated, and Illyria was incorporated with the patriarchate of Constantinople. Leo's son, Constantine V., Copronymus (741-775), inherited his father's views of image-worship. In 754 he convened an ecumenical synod in Constantinople. The three hundred and thirty-eight bishops assembled — none of the patriarchs were present, nor had the Pope sent any delegates — ascribed the re-introduction of idols and idol-worship among men to the influence of the Devil, and decided, on the basis of the first six ecumenical synods, that he who painted or worshipped an image of Christ must be either a Nestorian or an Eutychian; that the Eucharist is the only legitimate image of Christ, as it alone contains the whole Christ, both according to his human and according to his divine nature; that image-worship is forbidden by Scripture (John iv. 24, xx. 29; Deut. v. 8, 9; Rom. i. 23; 2 Cor. v. 7; Rom. x. 17), and by the fathers (Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Eusebius of Cesarea, and others); that, consequently, any one who makes or worships images shall be excommunicated and cursed, etc. All the clergy were compelled to subscribe these decisions, and the monks who refused were persecuted. A conspiracy was suppressed by the emperor with fearful severity: even the Patriarch of Constantinople was decapitated. The popes, however, rejected the canons of 754, and a synod of the Lateran condemned the iconoclasts in 789. Under Irene, who after the death of her husband, Leo IV. Chazarus (780), was made regent during the minority of her son (Constantine VI.), a change took place in the policy of the imperial government. Images were tolerated. The monks, iconodulists by profession, again stepped forward; and their zeal and influence increased rapidly, as did their number. An ecumenical
can pray, or in which he can confide . . . but because they image forth to man such a divine power, and because the honor and veneration which he shows them refer to the reality they represent. But history shows both how utterly unable the great mass of the people are to make such a distinction, and how very little the Roman-Catholic Church cares about having it made. Indeed, the very same arguments which she once rejected when the Pagans presented them in favor of their idol-worship, she now urges in favor of her own image-worship. The primitive Christians condemned all use of images in the church. (See the acts of the synod of Elvira, 305, c. 36.) They evidently feared that somehow the representation might be taken for the reality. But when, in the fourth and fifth centuries, the whole uneducated mass of the people was admitted into the congregations, the images began to invade the churches, and the common plea for them was their power of teaching. Gregory the Great, in a letter to Bishop Serenus of Marseille (Lib. IX., Ep. 105), recommends their use in the churches, on the ground that they enable those who know not their letters to read on the wall what they cannot read in the books. But the danger connected with the use of images is apparent from the very same letter; for the reason why Serenus had destroyed a number of images was just that his congregation adored them. When the Council of Nicaea (787) legitimized not only the use, but the worship, of images, the Libri Carolini appeared as a refutation; and the author emphasizes the fact (III. 18), that though images might be used as memorials of the great events of the history of the Church, and as adornment of the walls, without harm to the educated, who worshipped only the reality behind the representations, they cannot help seducing the uneducated, who worship only what they see. The Frankish Church was strongly opposed to the introduction of images. The synod of Frankfurt (794) rejected the decisions of the Second Council of Nicaea (though the Pope, Adrian I., had accepted them), and condemned the iconoclasts. The opposition was continued through the ninth century. A synod of Paris (825) repeated the rejection of the decisions of the Pope and the Council of Nicaea in a rather emphatic manner; and Claudius of Turin, Agobard, Jonas of Orleans, and other bishops, were decided enemies of images. At last, however, Rome prevailed; and the peculiar tendency the Roman-Catholic Church has to ascribe divine character to the various mediators she places between God and man, showed itself also in this field. What The Church can do with images and their use, is, to say the least, somewhat equivocal (Summa Quest. 23, art. 4, 5), and so are the expositions of Boua ventura. But Bel larmin is completely unequivocal. Without any remonstrance from the side of the Church, he teaches, in his De Imaginibus Sanctorum, that images of Christ and the saints shall be worshipped in the proper sense of the word, so that the devotion does not stretch beyond the image towards the object which it represents, but remains at rest in the image itself, such as it is. Thus the difference between the honor due to the image is one of degree only, not of kind; one of quantity only, not of quality.
IMMAM.

The sources of the history of the great controversy are Goldast: Imperialis decreta de cultu Imaginum, Frankfurt, 1668; Mansi: Concil. Coll., T. XIII.; John of Damascus: λόγος ἵππο-

 limit it to twelve persons. Eleven Imams Gesch., 1876; K. Schenki: Kaiser Leo I. Ein Gesch. d. bilderschlüssigen Kaiser, Frankfurt, 1879; Schlo-

 can: Gesch. d. bilderschlüssigen Kaiser, Frankfurt, 1872; Marx: D. Bilderstreich d. byzantinischen Kaiser, Treves, 1839; Kurtz: Handbuch d. allge-

 meinen Kirchengesch., 3d ed., Mitiav, 1834; Her-


HERZOGR.

IMAM, the priest who leads the prayers of a Mohammedan congregation, and in Turkey also performs the rites of circumcision, marriage, and burial. The name comes from the Koran (Sura II., "The Cow," v. 118: "When his Lord made trial of Abraham, by commands which he fulfilled, he said, 'I am about to make thee an Imam [priest] to mankind'). The title "Imam" is borne by the caliphs, or successors of Moham-

ned, and thus has the secondary meaning of "the head of the faith." The present Osmanli dynasty of Turkish sultans arrogates the title on the ground that the last legitimate caliph, El Mutawakkel, in 1517 ceded his right to it to Selim I., the first sultan, and his heirs. But the Shiites, or Shias, the so-called heretical Mohammedans, deny the right of the sultan to this title, and limit it to twelve persons. Eleven Imams have already appeared; the twelfth is announced. Indeed, they look for his appearance at any time.

IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF THE VIRGIN MARY, a modern dogma of the Roman Church, which exempts the Virgin Mary from all personal contact with sin, and in this respect puts her above all other descendants of Adam, and on the same scale of sinless purity as Christ. It was proclaimed by Pope Pius IX., on the Feast of the Conception, Dec. 8, 1854, in the Church of St. Peter and in the presence of more than two hundred cardinals, bishops, and other dignitaries, in these words: "That the most blessed Virgin Mary, in the first moment of her conception, the perpetual virginity of the family of the redeemed, and declared absolutely free from all complication with the fall of Adam and its consequences. The definition of such a dogma presupposes a divine revelation; for God omniscient alone knows the fact of the immaculate conception; and, as the Bible nowhere informs us of it, God must have revealed it to Pius IX. in 1854, either directly, or through the voice of the six hundred bishops assenting to his view. But, if he was really infallible, he did not need the advice of others.

From the Roman stand-point, this dogma completes the Mariology and Mariolatry, which, step by step, proceeded from the perpetual virginity of Mary to her freedom from actual sin after the assumption of the Virgin to the dissertation of the Virgin after her birth, and at last to her freedom from original or hereditary sin. The only thing left now is to proclaim the dogma of her assumption to heaven, which has long since been a pious opinion in the Roman Church. To this corresponds the progress in the worship of Mary, and the multiplication of her festivals. Her worship even overshadows the worship of Christ. She, the tender, compassionate, lovely woman, is in-

voked for her powerful intercession, rather than her divine Son. She is made the fountain of all grace, the mediatrix between Christ and the believer, and is virtually put in the place of the Holy Ghost. There is scarcely an epithet of Christ which devout Roman Catholics do not apply to the Virgin (see St. Liguori's Glories of Mary); and Pius Pius IX., who was himself an intense worshipper of Mary, sanctioned the false interpretation of Gen. iii. 15, that she (not Christ) "crushed the head of the serpent."

As to the history of the dogma, no passage in its favor can be found in the Old or New Testament; for the interpretation of the Protevangelium just alluded to is clearly ruled out by the Hebrew text. On the contrary, the Bible declares all men to be sinners, and in need of redemption, and exempts Christ alone, the sinless Redeemer, from this universal rule. Mary herself calls God her Saviour (Luke i. 47), and thereby includes herself in the number of the saved; which implies her sense of personal sin and guilt. With this corresponds also the mediatrix given her by the angel (i. 28).—"endued with grace, highly favored" (ευφαγανωμενη, which the Vulgate has mischievously changed into the active gratia plena, "full of grace"). The Christian fathers, though many of them (even St. Augustine) ex-

plained the word, the concept of the actual transgression, knowing nothing of her freedom from original sin but always imply, and often expressly teach, the contrary. Some (as Ireneus, Tertullian, Origen, and Chrysostom) interpret Christ's words at the wedding of Cana (John ii. 4) as a rebuke of her unreasonable haste and immoderate ambition. The origin of the dogma must be sought in the
Apoxyphal Gospels, which substituted mythology for real history, and nourished superstition rather than rational faith.

The doctrine crept into theology through the door of worship. The first clear trace of it is found in the twelfth century, in the south of France: when the canons of Languedoc introduced the festival of the conception of Mary, Dec. 8, 1139. This proves that the belief then existed as a pious opinion, but by no means as a dogma. On the contrary, St. Bernard, the greatest doctor and saint of his age, opposed the new festival as an unauthorized innovation, degrading to the dignity of Christ, the only sinless being in the world. He asked the canons of Lyons whence they discovered such a hidden fact. On the same ground they might appoint festivals for the conception of the mother, grandmother, and great-grandmother of Mary, and so back to the beginning. The same ground is taken essentially by the greatest schoolmen, as Anselm, Bonaventura, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas. But during the fourteenth century, through the influence chiefly of Duns Scotus, "the subtle doctor," the doctrine of the immaculate conception became a part of the theology of the Franciscans or Scotists, and was a bone of contention between them and the Dominicans or Thomists. They charged each other with heresy, for holding the one view or the other. The Council of Trent did not settle the question, but rather leaned towards the Franciscan side. Soon afterwards the Jesuits took up the same side, and defended it against the Jansenists. To their zeal and perseverance, and their influence over Pope Pius IX., the recent triumph of the dogma is chiefly due. The whole Roman-Catholic world quietly acquiesced until the Vatican Council roused the "Old Catholic" opposition against papal infallibility, which extended also to the dogmas of the immaculate conception.

-Lit. — The papal bull Ineffabilis Deus (Dec. 8, 1854); FERRONE: On the Immaculate Conception (Latin, German, etc., 1849); PASSAGLIA: De immac. Deipara semper Virg. conc. (1854 sq., 3 vols.); FETI X:'The Doctrine of the Immaculate Conception (German and English, 1865); recalled by the author when he seceded from the Lutheran to the Roman Church in St. Louis, Mo.; PUSEY: Eirenikon (part ii. 1867); H. B. SMITH, in the Method. Quarterly Rev. for 1855; HASE: Handbook of Protestant Polemics (1871); SCHAFF, in Johnson's Cyclopaedia. Of older Catholic works we mention J TURRECREMATA: De veritate conceptionis beat. Virginis (1547; re-published by Pusey, 1869); and J. DE LAUNOY, a Jansenist: Prescriptions de Conceptu B. Mariae Virg. (1677),—both against the immaculate conception.

IMMANUEL, a Hebrew word meaning "God with us," occurring in the prophecy spoken by Isaiah to Ahaz concerning the speedy downfall of Syria (Isa. vii. 14). But the Holy Spirit has taught us (in Matt. i. 23) to see, in the "virgin" who bore Immanuel in the days of Ahaz, the type of the Virgin Mary, who bore Jesus the Messiah, the Son of God. See the commentaries upon Isa. vii. 14 and Matt. i. 23.

IMMERSION. See BAPTISM.

IMMORTALITY. The motives for belief in immortality, which are to be found in men's hopes and fears, are of a subjective nature; and there lies in such motives doubt of the truth of immortality; hence, from of old, men have sought for purely objective grounds for this belief. Christian faith finds them in the resurrection of Christ. But this belief possesses objective worth only to those who stand in the Christian faith. Moreover, belief in immortality is a great help and support to, if not one of the conditions of, Christian faith: hence not only ancient, but also Christian, philosophy searches for objective grounds for belief in immortality without the religious province. Such ground is sometimes supposed to be found in the nature of the soul, in the difference between psychological and physical appearances, in the opposition of body and soul as two distinct substances. But this would only show that the soul may continue in existence, not that it must.

To prove from the nature of the soul its necessary existence, it must be assumed that the soul is a simple substance, immaterial and indivisible, and therefore not to be dissolved, like the body, into its elements. But Kant objected, that even though the soul appears to be one and simple, it cannot, therefore, be assumed that it is so. No psychology, at least, has succeeded in reducing the different activities of the soul to one simple power. The soul may be a unity; but it cannot be conceived as a simple substance which should exclude all inherent manifoldness of powers. The separation between the material and the immaterial should not in our conceptions be carried so far as to threaten to tear body and soul apart, and to make their union an incomprehensible miracle. Nothing is gained by referring to the self-conscious activity of the soul as evidence of an indestructible power. Self-consciousness may be lost through disturbances of the brain, and narcotics; but the reason, according to its nature, is an indestructible power. Self-consciousness may be lost, etc.

The soul may be a unity; but it cannot be conceived as a simple substance which should exclude all inherent manifoldness of powers. The separation between the material and the immaterial should not in our conceptions be carried so far as to threaten to tear body and soul apart, and to make their union an incomprehensible miracle. Nothing is gained by referring to the self-conscious activity of the soul as evidence of an indestructible power. Self-consciousness may be lost through disturbances of the brain, and narcotics; but the reason, according to its nature, is an indestructible power. Self-consciousness may be lost, etc.
IMMUNITY.

Upon what substance, then, is the psychical power bound? — upon the body, or some special substance? Nothing prevents us from supposing that the soul is a centre of those particular powers which lie at the ground of psychical appearances; i.e., that these powers are not bound up with the atoms of the body, but form a centre for themselves; and they are united with the substances and powers of the body only in an intimate relation of action and re-action.

The unity of consciousness is the pledge of the union of the soul with a body corresponding to it. According to natural science this process may be regarded as constantly repeating itself, and, with that, natural science may stop. But it cannot deny the possibility that this process may come to an end in a last act through the union of the soul with a body no more separable from it; and reason demands such a conclusion, because an endless, aimless circling is unreasonable.

Therefore real science cannot conflict with the belief in immortality; but, in consistency, it must allow it, and affirm, if not its truth, at least its probability. Now, after we have won such objective grounds for the belief, it receives higher importance from religious, natural, and moral motives. It is a postulate of the ethical belief in God as love. Reason leads to the same result; for reason which obtains throughout the creation requires the conception of the highest end, and, therefore, the passing from temporal becoming into eternal being. So, also, the ethical ideas of the true, good, and beautiful, lead to the same conclusion. These are ideals whose perfect realization involves immortality.

Christianity affirms not only the continuance of the soul, but also the resurrection of the body, i.e., the restoration of the body, or the re-union of the soul with a new, similar (more perfect) embodiment. This Christian faith is not contradicted by physical or psychical facts: on the contrary, it seems to be required even by them. Consciousness is restored after interruptions of it through bodily injuries, and with its previous contents unchanged: in like manner, not only may consciousness be restored after separation of the soul and body; but it must be restored so soon as the soul enters into union with the same or a similar organization. Absolutely the same body cannot be restored. The only question, then, is whether the re-union of the soul with a new, similar body, is physically conceivable. We affirm that it is not only tenable, but is required, because it lies wholly in the consequence of the principles which rule nature, and are proved by natural science; for nature everywhere tends to give to conditioned forces the possibility also of their exercise, the sphere for their activity. All properties of nature find without themselves continually the means and conditions under which to manifest their activity. In this consists the very order and regularity of nature. Consequently natural science must suppose, that, for the soul also, there shall be preserved room, not only for the temporary and passing play of its powers, but also for their enduring activity; that the force of consciousness, although temporarily robbed of its power of manifestation, is destined to make itself avail again in re-union with a body corresponding to it. According to natural science this process may be regarded as constantly repeating itself, and, with that, natural science may stop. But it cannot deny the possibility that this process may come to an end in a last act through the union of the soul with a body no more separable from it; and reason demands such a conclusion, because an endless, aimless circling is unreasonable.

Therefore real science cannot conflict with the belief in immortality; but, in consistency, it must allow it, and affirm, if not its truth, at least its probability. Now, after we have won such objective grounds for the belief, it receives higher importance from religious, natural, and moral motives. It is a postulate of the ethical belief in God as love. Reason leads to the same result; for reason which obtains throughout the creation requires the conception of the highest end, and, therefore, the passing from temporal becoming into eternal being. So, also, the ethical ideas of the true, good, and beautiful, lead to the same conclusion. These are ideals whose perfect realization involves immortality.

[The scientific argument for the probability of immortality has recently been presented with much force by Professors Tait and Balfour Stew-
conditions, than secular property; finally, the principle of immunity was declared a divine ordination, and acknowledged as such, for instance, by the emperor Frederic I. in his Authentica (Fertz: Mon. 243). Instead of requiring more formal acts of an oath or of an affirmation, the new doctrine required a symbolic act, similar to the laying on of hands, without which the power of the papal court was of no effect. The few instances which have been preserved, show that the church was not careless in this matter, and that the giving of a solemn oath was the act through which the cause was formally brought before the court. Thus, for instance, a person who had committed a crime and was accused of impanation; and the same accusation was even brought against the emperor Frederic II. in his Autlzenica (Pertz: c. 20) undertook to defend the principle of immunity, that the bull In cerna Domini excommunicated any one who should infringe upon the immunities of the church, that Urban VIII. in 1626 established a special department of the curia as Congregatio Jurisdictionis et Ecclesiae, the absolute State was by its own principle compelled to destroy such privileges and particular rights, and the constitutional State followed in its track. While the syllabus of Dec. 8, 1664, still clings to the principle of ecclesiastical immunity as a divine ordinance, the military laws of Germany and France (1871-73) grant only a partial exemption from military service to the clergy. [See F. Chambn: De l'immunité ecclésiastique et monastique, Paris, 1878.]

**IMpanatio.** From "in" and "panis," "bread.") denotes one of the many modifications of the doctrine of the real presence of the flesh and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, which arose in opposition to the doctrine of transubstantiation. Ruprecht of Deutz, who died in 1135, is the father of this idea. In his Comm. in Eoz., ii. 10 (Opera, p. 267, Cologne, 1602) he explains how God connects the real flesh and blood of Christ with the real bread and wine in the Eucharist, without disturbing the substance of either, just as, in the womb of the Virgin, He connected the Word and the human nature without changing the character of the latter. The word impanatio, however, is first used by a contemporary of his, Alger of Liège, who died in 1131, and wrote against him, in defence of transubstantiation, In pane Chri- tum impanatam, scire Deum in carne personaliter incarnatum. In the period of the Reformation Carstadt accused Oslander of holding the view that the word of power in order that he might not be peremptorily denied to have used such expressions; but when we remember how well he liked to be called the personal spiritual-patriarchal laying-on of hands. But in the Roman Church the latter continues as a practice, in connection with the consecrating of catechumens, the preparation for baptism, confirmation, and particularly ordination, where the laying-on of hands constitutes the specific visible sign of the sacrament.

**Impostoribus.** De Tribus. In his encyclical (May 21, July 1, 1239) Gregory IX. accused Frederic II. of having said that the world had been deceived by three impostors, — Jesus, Moses, and Mohammed; that he who thought that God, the Creator of the world, could be born of a woman, was a fool; that nothing ought to be believed but that which is self-evident, or can be proved, etc. The emperor peremptorily denied ever to have used such expressions; but when we remember how well he liked to be called the precursor of the Antichrist, how infatuated he was by Arab philosophy, and how ant clericalism was even in the whole atmosphere of the Hohenstaufen court, it seems not improbable that he may have entertained very sceptical views, though there is no direct proof. So much for the origin of the phrase. With respect to the book having this or a similar phrase for its title, there circulated in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the most singular and contradictory rumors concerning its date and author, and even concerning its contents; for the book itself seemed to have disappeared. See Genthe: De impostura religionum, Leipzig, 1833. The text edited by E. Weller in 1846, and again in 1876, is derived from a copy found in the Royal Library of Dresden, and dated 1598. But there must have been earlier editions, as the book is mentioned by Wilhelm Postel in 1563; and Campanella, who was accused of being its author, says that it was published thirty years before he was born, i.e. in 1508. The contents of the book are sceptical throughout: even the ideas of the existence of God and the necessity of worshipping him are undermined. But the argumentation shows often a glaring lack of religious sense and theological knowledge, and has probably never led any one astray.

W. MöLLER.
IMPUTATION.

IMPUTATION OF SIN AND OF RIGHT-EOUSNESS. I. THE WORD IN ITS SCRIPTURAL USAGE. — It is represented in the Old Testament by the Hebrew ימִית (yimēt), and in the Septuagint and New Testament by the Greek word λογίζομαι (logizomai). These words occur frequently in Scripture, and are variously translated in the authorized version; e.g., "to think" (Job xxxv. 2; Rom. ii. 3), "to impute" (Isa. xxxiii. 8), "to esteem" (Isa. xxix. 16, 17; Rom. iv. 14), "to reckon" (2 Sam. iv. 2), "to be reckoned for or among" (Rom. iv. 4, Luke xxii. 37), "to impute" (Lev. vii. 18; Rom. iv. 6-8), to lay to one's charge (2 Tim. iv. 16), to count (Rom. iv. 6). Liddell and Scott define λογίζομαι equivalent to "to count, deem, consider that any thing is." Cremer (Bib. Theo. Lex. of New Testament Greek) says, λογίζομαι τί έξίν είσται equivalent to "to reckon anything to a person; to put to his account, either in his favor, or as to what he must be answerable for.

II. THE DOCTRINE OF THE IMPUTATION OF ADAM'S FIRST SIN TO HIS DESCENDANTS. — The foregoing citations make it plain that the "imputation of sin" cannot be a physical act, or the making any one subjectively sinful, but that it is always a forensic act, or a charging to one the guilt of any sin as a ground of punishment. To "impute sin" is punitively to lay it to one's charge (2 Tim. iv. 16): "not to impute sin" is to remit the punishment, or to acquit or to justify the person.

The entire historical church from the first has equally repudiated the two antithetic heresies of Manicheism and Pelagianism. In denying Manicheism, or the doctrine that sin is a substance, eternal and self-existent, the whole church has maintained that sin could have originated only in an apostatizing self-decision of an intelligent and free creature. In denying Pelagianism she has uniformly held that all infants come into the world with their moral natures depraved and guilty, and therefore needing redemption before they have individually done either good or evil. This problem involves, therefore, three distinct though related questions. (1) If all men, except the first, come into existence with natures morally corrupt anterior to personal agency of whatever kind, then how can Manicheism be avoided, and their sin be shown to originate in an act of personal self-decision? (2) How can God be justified in bringing (whether directly or mediately through natural law, it makes no difference) this root of all evils upon new-created creatures at the beginning of their careers? (3) How can this natural depravity be regarded as guilt, and not as disease and misfortune?

Origen, followed only by a few individuals, has answered all these questions at once by maintaining that all human souls had a personal probation (a probationizing state); that the sinful character of each infant is a righteousness imposed penal consequence of his own personal apostasy in that state (De Principiis, II., 11.). Dr. Julius Muller (Christian Doctrine of Sin, vol. ii. p. 157) in like manner refers this natural depravity to a transcendental and timeless personal self-decision after each soul.

But the historical church in all its branches has answered these three questions at once by teaching that this natural depravity, which inheres each human soul from birth, is, in every case, a penal consequence of Adam's apostatizing act. Augustine (De Civ. Dei, lib. xiii. c. 3 ad 14; Op. imperf. c. Jud. lib. iv. § 104); Dr. G. Wiggers (Augustinianism and Pelagianism, chap. 2, § 2); Anselm (Cur Deus Homo? lib. ii. cap. 5; De Conceptu Virg. et Orig. Par. caput xvi.); Thomas Aquinas (Summa Theol., i. quaest. 100, ad ii. quaest. 81 and 82); Council of Trent (Sess. 1 and 2); Bellarmine (Amiss. Grat., lib. iii. 1); Philip Melanchthon (Apol. Aug. Conf., 46, 47; Exp. Symb. Nicen., in Corp. Refor., xxiii. 403, 58; Formula Concord., Pars ii. 1; De Prec. Orig., 27); Quenstedt (Ques. Theo. Dict., Pol. i. 991); Calvin (Instit. Theol., bk. ii. chap. 1, §§ 4-7; Second Helv. Conf., cap. viii. § 1); Zacharias Ursinus (Summe of Christian Religion; Lectures on Heidelberg Catechism; Origin of Sin; What are the Causes of Sin?); Amuesius (Medial. Theol., lib. i. cap. 17); H. Witsius (Expos. of Doctr., bk. i. chap. 8, §§ 83, 84); J. Arminius (Public Disputations, Disq. 7, and Private Disputations, Disq. 31); Robert Watson (Institutes of Theology, pt. ii. chap. xviii.); President Witherspoon (Works, vol. iv. p. 90).

But, while the entire church has been thus far agreed, different schools have widely differed as to the true answer to the question. On what ground the descendants of Adam are held legally responsible for, i.e., punishable on account of, his first sin? The tendency at the first was to ascribe it to the natural relation of Adam alone, and sin was regarded as proscribed et traduc or ex traduc. Thus Tertullian taught that Adam is fons generis et princi, and his soul matrix omnium (Dorner's System of Christian Doctrine, pt. ii. § 74). This obviously accounts for the fact of innate pollution, but not of guilt: it shows how sin descends, but not how the permission that it should thus descend consists with the justice of God. Therefore Augustine strove to introduce a moral ground for our sharing in the penal consequences of Adam's sin by showing that our wills were in some way represented in his will. "Omnis enim fuitus in illo, quando omnes fuitus ille unus" (De Civ. Dei, lib. xiii. cap. xiv.).

This conception of the fall was repeated in various forms, but with virtual identity, until the appearance of the "federal theory," about the age of the Reformation. Sometimes it has been illustrated and re-enforced by realistic philosophy, but oftener it has stood alone as a revealed fact, or as a necessary inference from revealed facts. The federal view presupposes the natural headship of Adam as the progenitor of the entire human race, and builds upon it the further idea of moral representation under the analogy of a covenant, including all mankind in their first parent. Dr. Charles F. Krauth says, "The possibilities of the federal idea are late in appearing; but the essential idea itself comes from the beginning in our (the Lutheran) theology." It was first prominently advanced by Catharinus in the Council of Trent (F. Paul Sarpi's History of Council of Trent, translated by Sir N. Brent, London, 1876, pp. 162-169), and by Hyperius, Olevianus, and others.

But the federal idea is not of Adam's sin by showing that our wills were in some way represented in his will. "Omnis enim fuitus in illo, quando omnes fuitus ille unus" (De Civ. Dei, lib. xiii. cap. xiv.).
and Eve merited guilt and depravity for their posterity, and in this trial they represented the whole human race."

This view was generally adopted among all the churches, Arminian as well as Reformed, and has prevailed almost universally until the appearance of the modern school of German speculative theologians. The "federal theology" as a method of exhibiting the whole plan of God's dealings with men in creation and redemption, under the forms of the two covenants of works and of grace, is generally attributed to Cocceius, professor in Leyden (d. 1669); but it is certain that this conception had taken hold of the British Reformed churches from the first. This is proved from the Method of the Christian Religion, compiled by Ussher in the second decade of the seventeenth century (ed. iv. N. Byfield's (father of the clerk of the Westminster Assembly) Principles, or the Pattern of Wholesome Words, first edition, 1618; from Treatise of the Covenant of Grace, by J. Ball, published 1645, after his death; and from the Mysterium et Medulla Bibliorum, by Francis Roberts, London, 1657, a complete system of divinity on the method of covenants.

III. THE DOCTRINE OF THE IMPUTATION OF CHRIST'S RIGHTEOUSNESS TO HIS PEOPLE.

As Adam's apostatizing act is the guilty ground of the condemnation, alienation, and consequent depravity of the race, so the obedience and sufferings of Christ in their stead is the meritorious ground of the justification, reconciliation, and consequent regeneration of the beneficiaries of his redemption. This has virtually been the faith of the historical church from the beginning; although, from the prevalent confusion of the ideas of justification and sanctification, the ground of justification in imputed righteousness was not explicitly set forth before the Reformation, yet it was in essence involved in what the better schoolmen (as Anselm and Thomas Aquinas, etc.) taught as to the nature of the atonement, as to the headship of Christ, and as to the distinction between satisfaction and merit (Summa, pt. iii. ques. 48, 49). While the thought of Luther is fully expressed in the language of St. Bernard (Proc. c. err. Abelard, cap. vi. 15), the most evangelical of the schoolmen (as Anselm and Thomas Aquinas, etc.) taught as to the nature of the atonement, as to the headship of Christ, and as to the distinction between satisfaction and merit (Summa, pt. iii. ques. 48, 49). While the thought of Luther is fully expressed in the language of St. Bernard (Proc. c. err. Abelard, cap. vi. 15), the most evangelical of the schoolmen, "ut videlicet satisfactio unius omnibus imputetur, sic ut omnium peccata unius ille portavit."

This doctrine, in its strictest definition, was the characteristic of all the Reformers, and of the confessions and classical theology which has proceeded from them. The Roman-Catholic Church has established two cases of incapacity: women cannot be ordained, and men who are not baptized. In the latter case the incapacity is self-evident: in the former it is based on 1 Tim. ii. 12, 1 Cor. xiv. 34-35, and has never been doubted by the Church. The Protestant churches follow originally the same rules as the Roman Church, until lately some exceptions have been made with respect to women's incapacity.

INABILITY in theology means want of power to do God's will. It may be natural, when the cause is extrinsic to the will; moral, when the cause is inherent in the will. The New School Calvinistic theologians contended that man has not natural, but merely moral, inability: consequently he can serve God if he will. The Old School denied him ability of any kind. The Arminians do the same, but affirm gracious ability, whereby man is enabled to be saved. See A. A. Hodge: Outlines, chap. xx.; C. Hodge: Syr. Theol., ii. 257-277.

INCAPACITY, as an ecclesiastical term, denotes absolute unfitness for ordination. The Roman-Catholic Church has established two cases of incapacity: women cannot be ordained, and men who are not baptized. In the latter case the incapacity is self-evident: in the former it is based on 1 Tim. ii. 12, 1 Cor. xiv. 34-35, and has never been doubted by the Church. The Protestant churches follow originally the same rules as the Roman Church, until lately some exceptions have been made with respect to women's incapacity.

INCARNA TION. The doctrine of the incarnation, in its biblical elements and historical development, has already been treated in the article CHRISTOLOGY. Its present relation and importance, in view of modern conceptions of the creation, require distinct mention. Three points should be noticed as specially significant.

1. The present tendency among many theologians is to lay increased stress upon the ethical necessity of the incarnation. It is to be conceived of as an immanent necessity of the love of God, and as involved in the purpose of the best possible creation. It is necessary to the complete self-revelation and self-impartment of God to the creation, and also for the perfection and consummation of the creation. The incarnation is that full and final outgoing of God into his creation which satisfies God's own moral perfection. It is, therefore, ideally necessary, involved, that is, in the idea of a perfect God and a perfect creation. The purpose of creation may be said, therefore, to include the purpose of incarnation; and the incarnation may be regarded as an eternal counsel of God, irrespective of the contingency of sin, and purpose of redemption. This conception of an incarnation as the consummation of the creation, even had there been no sin, is not to be confounded with the conception of a pantheistic self-development of the divine nature. There was no metaphysical necessity, but a purely ethical necessity, of incarnation for the perfect God. Therefore this view of it does not diminish the glory of free grace; rather redemption through the Son of God is seen to be no after thought, or expedient of grace, but to be provided for, and made possible, in the eternal purpose of creation. Not only in the divine idea of creation was sin rendered possible, but also redemption through Him who is the completion and goal of the creation. The world was made capable of redemption in the same thought and purpose by which it was made capable of sinning. The incarnation, then, becomes a central and essen-
IN CENA DOMINI.


1. The birth of Jesus was the first moment in our theology. All God's ways from the beginning lead up to Christ. All God's ways from the beginning lead up to Christ.

2. More stress is laid in recent theology upon the cosmical relations of the incarnation. The old truth of the natural headship of Christ receives new significance in view of modern theories of the origin and unity of the creation. If a theistic evolution be assumed, the Christ is not dethroned, but exalted, as the goal of the whole ascent of life, the end and completion of all conceivable development, the perfect Man beyond whom there can be none higher, the Head over all, in whom humanity is raised to the throne of divinity, the second Man, who is the Lord from heaven. The whole universe is thus seen to be created for Christ, through whom all things shall at last be made subject unto the Father, that God may be all, and in all.

3. These conceptions and tendencies of modern theology are proving themselves helpful, also, in relation to the problem of the two natures in the person of Christ. This has been, from the beginning of Christian theology, its great transcendent problem; and no thought of man can be great enough to comprehend the mystery of God in Christ. But any conception which brings this miracle of history into new light, or more apparent harmony with reason, is a welcome contribution to theology. So far as any progress in this doctrine has been made since the Protestant confessions were worked out, it has been by applying to the incarnation the idea of development (as Professor Dorner has done); so that the incarnation may be conceived as a process of union of two natures in one person. “The Word became flesh.” This becoming flesh was real at the nativity. The birth of Jesus was the first moment of an actual, real incarnation. But it was not completed in the manger: the union of the two natures required the mediation of a life, as well as birth. It was a process begun at the nativity, and completed in the ascension of the Christ to the right hand of the Majesty on high. Room is thus found in this conception for the growth of the human nature, the coming to itself of the human soul; and, as far as and fast as the growth of the human nature permitted, it was made one in immutable union with the higher nature of the second man, the Lord from heaven. Christ was made perfect through suffering, and the life of Jesus was necessary to the perfection of the person of the Redeemer. Modern theology may be able to bring in this manner the fact of the incarnation into more hopeful relation to modern tendencies of thought; but imperfect as any conception of the mode of it must be, inadequate as are all human definitions of the method of God's love in the incarnation, the fact of it is the key to the creation and to history. This is the mystery of God, in whose light other mysteries are made plain. The incarnation, itself transcending reason, is the one sufficient, rational explanation of the universe.

INCHOFER, Melchior, b. 1584, in Vienna, or, according to others, at Gunz in Hungary; d. at Milan, Sept. 28, 1648; entered the Society of Jesus in 1607; taught philosophy and theology at Messina till 1636; lived for ten years in Rome. An intimate friend of Leo Allatius, and member of the Congregation of the Index; and was in 1646 appointed professor of the college of Macerata. Of his Epistola B. Marie V. ad Messanicenses veritas vindicata (1639), the first edition was put on the Index, and suppressed. In his Historia sacrae latinitatis (1635) he makes Latin the language of the blessed in the kingdom of heaven. In his Annales ecclesiastic i regni Hungariae (1644) he has invented a bull to prove the dependence of Hungary on Rome. He was at one time considered the author of the remarkable satire on the Jesuits, Monarchia Solipsorum, which, however, Audin has proved to belong to Speltho.

IN CENA DOMINI, the famous bull fulminating curses and excommunications, not only over all heretics and those who in any way support them, but also over all who oppose or wrong the church by taxing the clergy, appealing to a general council, etc., was drawn from several sources, and was, with various modification, published every year on Holy Thursday or Easter Monday, from the fourteenth century till 1770, when Clement XIV. discontinued the publication from a regard to the temporal powers, which could not help feeling offended by the tone and spirit of that document.

INCENSE. The burning of incense entered, as a symbolical act, very largely into the religious rituals of Judaism and Graeco-Roman Paganism. The Christian Church at first rejected the custom. See Tertullian: Apolog., 30; De cor. milit., 10; Athenagoras: Legat. pro Christ., 12; Arnobius: Adv. Gent., 7, 25. Later on, however, the Church adopted it. In the very minute descriptions of the administration of the Lord's Supper, in the Catechizes of Cyril and the Apostolical Constitutions, it is not mentioned. It occurs for the first time in the Catechism of the Roman Church (c. vii.), as Evagrius (sixth century, Hist. Eccl., vi. 21) speaks of a golden χωριατήριον, or censer, presented to the Church of Jerusalem by Chosroes. At that time it had become common in the Eastern Church to fume with incense the elements of the Lord's Supper,—a ceremony which is found at the beginning of the middle ages in the Frankish Church. See Capitul. i. 6, in Harduin: Conc. Coll., v. In the evangelical churches the custom was never adopted. See Frankincense. G. E. STRITZ.
INDEPENDENTS. See CONGREGATIONALISM.

INDEX LIBRORUM PROHIBITORUM is a list of books which the Roman-Catholic Church forbids its members to read, under penalty of excommunication. As a formally established institution, the Index dates back only to the sixteenth century; but the practice of forbidding the reading of books antagonistic to the interests of the Roman Church began very early. A Council of Carthage (400) even went so far as to forbid the reading of pagan books. It was, however, not so much the purity of the doctrines which the Roman Church meant to defend by those proceedings, as her position as a power in the world. Consequently, when, by the Reformation and the invention of the printing-press, the number of dangerous books began to multiply, the Council of Trent (1229) forbade laymen to have in their possession any of the books of the Old or New Testament. With the Reformation and the invention of the printing-press, the number of dangerous books attacking the Church, both her doctrines and her practices, increased in such a degree that a systematicatization of the old measures of prohibiting and forbidding became necessary; and in 1557 Paul IV. published in Rome the first official Index. In its eighteenth session the Council of Trent took the question under consideration, and a special committee was formed; but in its twenty-fifth session the council determined to place the whole affair under the direct authority of the Pope; and in 1564 Pius IV. issued a new Index, generally known as Index Tridentinus. Sixtus V. finally organized a special congregation of the Index, which is still in operation, and which, besides the Index librorum prohibitorum, also prepares an Index librorum expurgandorum; that is, a list of books which may be read after being expurgated, and freed from certain offensive passages. See Index librorum prohibitorum. Rome, 1570; RUSCH: D. Index d. verbotenen Bücker, Bonn, 1838-85, 2 vols.

INDIA, Religions of. See BRAHMANISM, BRAHMO SOMAJ, BUDDHISM.

INDIA, or Hindustan, is one of the most extensive empires of the world, possesses an august history, has given birth to the most prevalent religions of mankind, has preserved venerable works of literature and art, and for the last two generations has furnished the most violent opposition to, as well as enjoyed the most earnest labor of, Christian missionary endeavor.

COUNTRY. — India comprises an area of 1,474,000 square miles. Lying between the Himalayas on the north — the most sublime mountain peaks in the world, rising, at their highest elevation (Mount Everest), twenty-nine thousand feet above the sea — and the Bay of Bengal and the Indian Ocean on the south, it possesses a great variety of climate and scenery. The country, for the most part, is poorly watered; but the Brahmaputra and Ganges are two mighty rivers, the latter more than thirteen hundred miles in length. The present population is two hundred and forty millions, of whom a hundred and twenty thousand are Europeans. There are eighteen cities with a population of over one hundred thousand; and of these Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, and Lucknow are the largest.

PEOPLE. — The people are of mixed descent. The old aboriginal races, which inhabited the country before the time of Alexander the Great, still preserve their identity. The most ancient is the so-called Dravidian stock, which includes those speaking the Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam, etc. These natives are dusky in complexion. With them have been intermingled the conquering races from the north, the more noble Aryans (who have imposed their literature upon the country), and the Mahometans, coming from Persia, Arabia, and other Asiatic countries. The most recent intermixture has come from Europe, and more especially through the English, who approached India from the sea, and are now the dominant factor in Indian society, although insignificant in point of numbers. The population is divided, as to religion, amongst various forms of worship. Brahmanism, or Hinduism, is the most venerable in point of age, and goes back to the Indus in 327 B.C., but was finally Christianity, which is the youngest and last. See BUDDHISM and BRAHMANISM. The people are divided as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>329,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahometans</td>
<td>40,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhists</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikhs</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christians</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The people speak nearly a hundred languages, of which the principal are the Hindustani (Hindi, which is, strictly speaking, the proper term for the modern dialect), Bengali, Maharatta, Telugu, Tamil, Punjabi.

HISTORY. — The history of India reaches far back into dim antiquity, and has its chief interest to us as a history of invasions and the domination, in turn, of the foreign invaders, over the native populations. Alexander the Great crossed the Indus in 327 B.C., but was forced, by the discontent of his troops, to forego the ambition of waving his victorious sword over the peninsula. In 664 the first invasion of the followers of Mahomet occurred. They were repelled, but returned in greater force in 711, and subdued the Hindus of Sindh, but were driven back again. The great Mahometan invasion is
connected with the famous name of Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni (997-1030), fourteen of whose descendants sat on the throne of India. The name of that fierce warrior Timur (Tamerlane) also has a place in Indian history. He was crowned at Delhi in 1398. Of Indian sovereigns, the greatest has been Akbar the Great, whose reign extended from 1556 to 1605. He ruled over a large part of India, and his name is famous as that of a conqueror and an administrator.

The connection of modern Europe with India dates from the latter part of the fifteenth century. The history of the land is closely connected with the Portuguese, Dutch, and English, and also, to some extent, with the French. Columbus, when he set sail from Europe in 1492, steered his vessels, as he thought, towards India, or the East Indies as the country was then called. In 1498 Vasco da Gama cast anchor off the Indian city of Calicut, and the Portuguese at once began to establish trading-posts, and continued to have a monopoly of the trade during the whole of the sixteenth century. In 1509 the Portuguese governor, Albuquerque, seized Goa, which has ever since been the capital of the Portuguese possessions in India. The avowed object of the Portuguese was to promote the spread of Christianity, and conquer the land. They retain control of only a thousand and eighty-six square miles, with a population of four hundred thousand. In 1602 the Dutch East-India Company was organized. The Dutch were the first to disturb the undisputed possession of the Portuguese. During the sixteenth century, vessels from Holland had traded with Indian ports; and, in the first half of the seventeenth, the Dutch rapidly extended their possessions, expelling the Portuguese before them.

The first foundation of British empire in India was laid by the English East-India Company, which received a charter in 1600 from Queen Elizabeth. Its capital stock amounted then only to the modest sum of seventy thousand pounds. The wealth of this corporation grew with astonishing rapidity, and its power almost kept pace with its wealth. Lord Clive and Warren Hastings may be said to have been the architects of the British empire in India, which is usually dated from the battle of Plassey (June 23, 1757), in which Clive won a decisive victory. The influence of the Portuguese, Dutch, and French, henceforth waned before the dominant power of the English. He was appointed, in 1758, first governor of all the company's settlements in Bengal; and, after a visit to England, he filled the office for a second time,—from 1695 to 1697.

Warren Hastings arrived in India in 1772, and organized the administrative government of the empire which Clive had founded. From that time on, till the present, the British dominions in India have been extending, until, at the present time, there are eight provinces under the administration of England, stretching from the waters of Cape Comorin to the shadows of the Himalayas. The British people are seriously threatened only once (1857), by the Indian mutiny, which, spreading from an apparently insignificant cause, but really rooted in the aversion to the rulers, spread rapidly among the people, and entailed a series of quick and thrilling horrors upon the English residents. Until 1858 the East India Company, under various restrictions, exercised supreme sway over India, its power culminating in the "governor-general in council." In this year it was abolished, and India was placed under the immediate administration of the English Government. Its principal officer is called "viceroY," and a secretary for India sits in the cabinet. The Earl of Ripon has been viceroy since 1880. On Jan. 1, 1877, the Queen of England was proclaimed Empress of India.

During the century great changes have been effected in the condition of the population of India. It is not possible to separate these reforms from the direct influence of the missionaries. But there have been distinguished Christian governors-general of India, such as Lord Bentinck (1828-35), the Earl of Dalhousie (1848-66), and others, whose enlightened statesmanship has effected permanent and most salutary reforms in the administration of the courts, the abolition of revolting social customs, the promotion of education, and the extension of commercial benefits, such as the construction of railways, of which there were 8,215 miles in operation in 1878. To Lord Bentinck is due the honor of having suppressed the sutee, or the practice of burning widows alive on the graves of their husbands. In 1817 no less than seven hundred widows were committed to the flames in Bengal alone. By the decree of 1829 all who abetted suttee were declared guilty of "culpable homicide." It was this same enlightened administrator who suppressed the Thugs, a large and secret association of assassins, who spread terror through the land. To the government are also due measures for the suppression of infanticide, which once was practised to an enormous extent; female infants being particularly chosen as the victims.

Christian Missions.—India has been the chief seat of missionary endeavor for the last two generations. Nearly all the missionary organizations of Europe and America have made it a basis of operations; and with it will always be associated some of the proudest annals of modern missions,—Ziegenbalg, Schwartz, Henry Martyn, Carey, Marshman, Reginald Heber, and others. There Christianity was struggling through trials and discouragements, while the islands of the South Seas were rapidly emerging from darkness into the light. But, although the results were slow in showing themselves, the recent current towards Christianity has been strong, and has surpassed the most sanguine expectations. Although the proportion of Christians to the whole population is still small (one-half of one per cent), it must be remembered that the influence of the gospel cannot be accurately measured by numbers. Christian influences are, by the testimony of all parties, gradually undermining superstitious practices, and working a reform in the social life.

"Missions," said Lord Lawrence, "have done more to benefit India than all other agencies combined." Sir Bartle Frere said, "Missions have worked changes more extraordinary for India than any thing witnessed in modern Europe." Other testimonies from civilians, to the
same import, might be added if necessary. An ancient tradition represents that St. Thomas planted Christianity in India. We come to solid ground when Francis Xavier (d. 1552) was sent out as a missionary by the king of Portugal. In 1545, Goa was made the first (Catholic) bishopric of India. One of the professed objects of the Portuguese occupation of India was the spread of the gospel. After various vicissitudes, Roman Catholicism continues to flourish; but its influence in elevating the tone of the moral and social life of the people is hardly perceptible. The earliest Protestant mission to India was founded by Frederick IV. of Denmark in 1705; and in 1708 Ziegenbalg arrived at Tranquebar, and began his devoted labors. The translation of the Scriptures into Tamil was begun by him. This Danish mission passed, in 1823, over to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. In 1751 Christian Friedrich Schwartz (venerabil et praecolium nomen), having been ordained at Copenhagen, arrived at the mission. He died in 1798, but had lived long enough to win the confidence of the Indian mind and to acquire undying fame. At the present time, thirty-five Protestant societies have missionaries in India. There are six hundred and eighty-nine ordained European and American ministers, two hundred and forty-four of whom are from England. It will be possible here only to give a brief account of the labors of the principal of these societies, and we shall arrange them according to the date of their beginning operations.

The English Baptist Missionary Society began its work in India in 1793, when William Carey arrived (Nov. 7) in Bengal. He established himself thirty miles from Calcutta; then at Mudanbatty, two hundred and sixty miles north of Calcutta, where he opened a school (1798), and put up a printing-press; and finally at Serampore, which became a distinguished centre of light for all India, and from whose printing-presses issued many of the languages of the land. In 1799 this mission was re-enforced by those devoted laborers, Ward and Marshman. In 1800 the first part of the New Testament had been translated into Bengalee, and of the New Testament into Sanscrit, was completed. Carey died June 9, 1834. His example, heroism, and missionary devotion will ever stamp him as one of the apostles of India. Statistics of 1881: English missionaries, 37; evangelists, 131; native communicants, 3,467; day schools, 104; scholars, 2,226.

The London Missionary Society sent three missionaries to India in 1804, who established themselves at Vizagapatam, five hundred and fifty miles south-west of Calcutta. In 1819 its agents had translated the whole New Testament into the Telugu language. In 1836 it established assistants to the Bishop of Madras; in 1868, in Travancore; 1816, at Calcutta, etc. Statistics of 1882: 48 English missionaries, 271 native ordained ministers and preachers, 5,210 communicants, 378 schools, 5,928 scholars.

The American Board began its labors in India in 1812, when Judson, Marshman, Nott, Newell, and Hall sailed for there. The opposition of the government forced them all to retire. Hall and Nott went to Bombay, but were not fairly settled in their work till 1814. The following year they were sufficiently proficient in the Mahratta language to begin preaching. In March, 1816, they introduced the first printing-press in Bombay, and at once set to work to translate and print the New Testament. In 1818 there were eleven schools under the care of the Board, with an attendance of six hundred scholars. On May 12, 1823, the chapel was dedicated in Madras, the first Christian temple on the western side of the Indian peninsula. In 1821 Newell died, Hall following him in 1826. In 1831 occurred the first Christian marriage of a Brahman. The missionaries established a native temperance society in 1832, binding its members to abstain from strong drink, opium, and tobacco. In 1839 there was strong opposition against the missionaries on account of their success; and a legal process was instituted to force them to abstain from the work of making converts, but in vain. In 1843 the opposition took the form of printing native books and papers at Bombay, and refuting Christianity from the writings of Paine, Voltaire, and other infidel authors. The translation of the entire Scriptures into Mahratta was completed in 1847, the New Testament having been finished in 1826. The American Board has two centres of missions in India Proper,—Maratha in Western India, and Madura in Southern India; and in 1881 employed 52 missionaries and assistant missionaries, and 583 native helpers. Its churches had 3,931 members, and 5,699 scholars in its schools. In Ceylon it employs 18 missionaries, 172 native helpers, and has 972 church-members, and 8,981 scholars.

The Church Missionary Society (English) began its labors in India at Agra in 1813, and at Madras in 1815. It had encouraged the Danish missions before. It directed its efforts at the first mainly to Tranquebar and Tinnevelly. In 1853 it had 5,815 communicants, and 17,000 scholars in its schools. Statistics of 1882: 103 European and 121 native missionaries, 2,149 communicants, 1,157 schools with 8,633 boy and 11,452 girl scholars. In Ceylon it employs 18 European and 14 native missionaries, and has 1,836 communicants.

The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (English) began its Indian mission in 1818, at Calcutta. In 1853 it had 48 missions, with 166 assistants, 4,629 communicants, and 5,500 scholars. Its missions in the Punjab and Sind in Northern India are making rapid progress. Since 1877 the accessions of this society in Tinnevelly alone amount to 20,000, and it has 90,000 adherents in that district. These two societies of the Church of England have the largest number of adherents in India. The Church of England has at present four Indian episcopal sees,—Calcutta (Metropolitan), Bombay, Madras, and Lahore, with six bishops, Drs. Sargent and Caldwell being strategic centres. In the former lace their missions before. It direct its efforts at the first mainly to Tranquebar and Tinnevelly. In 1853 it had 5,815 communicants, and 17,000 scholars in its schools. Statistics of 1882: 103 European and 121 native missionaries, 2,149 communicants, 1,157 schools with 8,633 boy and 11,452 girl scholars. In Ceylon it employs 18 European and 14 native missionaries, and has 1,836 communicants.

The Wesleyan Missionary Society (English) began its work, through the Rev. Mr. Lynch, in Madras, in 1817. In 1830 the number of missionaries was nine, and of schools twenty-five. Mysore and Calcutta have been their two most important strategic centres. In the former lace their missions before. It direct its efforts at the first mainly to Tranquebar and Tinnevelly. In 1853 it had 5,815 communicants, and 17,000 scholars in its schools. Statistics of 1882: 103 European and 121 native missionaries, 2,149 communicants, 1,157 schools with 8,633 boy and 11,452 girl scholars. In Ceylon it employs 18 European and 14 native missionaries, and has 1,836 communicants.
The Church of Scotland sent out its first missionary to India in 1829, in the person of Dr. Duff, who arrived in Calcutta in 1830. During his long and eminently useful career he secured the respect of all classes; and his eloquent voice on his visits to Scotland and the United States aroused the deepest interest in the great cause of missions. He established a collegiate institute in Calcutta, which has been attended by hundreds of Hindus. Dr. John Wilson, about the same time, inaugurated the work of the Church of Scotland at Bombay. The disruption of 1843 in the Scotch Church led to a division of the work in India; and both the Established and Free churches support their own missionary force. Narayan Sheshadri, the converted Brahman who has made two visits to America (in 1873 and 1880), is connected with the Free Church. In 1882 it had 112 schools, 1,524 scholars, 1,290 communicants.

The American Presbyterian Mission in India was started in 1834 by the arrival of William Read and John C. Lowrie. These missionaries chose as the scene of their labors the northern provinces, where no missionaries had, up to that time, penetrated. Lodi was the first centre of operations (1834). The Gospel of John was translated, in 1840, into the Punjabi, the language of the Sikhs. The mission has been very successful. In 1842 three presbyteries were constituted,—Lodi, Furrukhabad, and Allahabad,—and in 1855 the first meeting of the synod of Northern India convened at Futtahr. Kopaloo is now a fourth centre of missionary operations. According to the report of 1882, the mission has 5,570 boys and 2,341 girls in its schools, and carries on its work through 50 American, 15 native preachers, and 52 American female, and 171 native lay missionaries. The number of communicants connected with the mission is 1,019, and its annual expenditure $102,982.

The Basel Missionary Society opened a mission on the west coast of India in 1834. In 1850 it had 28 missionaries and the same number of native assistants, with 4,851 communicants. It now has 1,100 communicants.

The American Baptist Mission was begun in 1835; is interested more especially in the Telugu, of whom there are 15,000,000, whose district lies on the eastern coast, and stretches nearly eight hundred miles, south of the northern borders of the Carnatic to Orissa. In 1854 this society had one station, two missionaries, nine communicants, and carries on its work through 30 American, 15 native preachers, and 48 unordained native preachers, with 1,916 church-members and 1,307 probationers. Its day schools number 242, with an attendance of 8,500 scholars. The Conference of South India was organized in 1876, and consists of four districts,—Bombay, Madras, Calcutta, and Allahabad. In 1881 it employed 27 foreign missionaries and 38 native preachers. The total number of communicants was 1,253, and of probationers 726. It carries on 14 day schools, with an attendance of 800.

The American Baplist Mission was begun in 1834; is interested more especially in the Telugu, of whom there are 15,000,000, whose district lies on the eastern coast, and stretches nearly eight hundred miles, south of the northern borders of the Carnatic to Orissa. In 1854 this society had one station, two missionaries, nine communicants, and carries on its work through 30 American, 15 native preachers, and 48 unordained native preachers, with 1,916 church-members and 1,307 probationers. Its day schools number 242, with an attendance of 8,500 scholars. The Conference of South India was organized in 1876, and consists of four districts,—Bombay, Madras, Calcutta, and Allahabad. In 1881 it employed 27 foreign missionaries and 38 native preachers. The total number of communicants was 1,253, and of probationers 726. It carries on 14 day schools, with an attendance of 800.

The American Baptist Mission was begun in 1835; is interested more especially in the Telugu, of whom there are 15,000,000, whose district lies on the eastern coast, and stretches nearly eight hundred miles, south of the northern borders of the Carnatic to Orissa. In 1854 this society had one station, two missionaries, nine communicants, and carries on its work through 30 American, 15 native preachers, and 48 unordained native preachers, with 1,916 church-members and 1,307 probationers. Its day schools number 242, with an attendance of 8,500 scholars. The Conference of South India was organized in 1876, and consists of four districts,—Bombay, Madras, Calcutta, and Allahabad. In 1881 it employed 27 foreign missionaries and 38 native preachers. The total number of communicants was 1,253, and of probationers 726. It carries on 14 day schools, with an attendance of 800.

The American Baptist Mission was begun in 1835; is interested more especially in the Telugu, of whom there are 15,000,000, whose district lies on the eastern coast, and stretches nearly eight hundred miles, south of the northern borders of the Carnatic to Orissa. In 1854 this society had one station, two missionaries, nine communicants, and carries on its work through 30 American, 15 native preachers, and 48 unordained native preachers, with 1,916 church-members and 1,307 probationers. Its day schools number 242, with an attendance of 8,500 scholars. The Conference of South India was organized in 1876, and consists of four districts,—Bombay, Madras, Calcutta, and Allahabad. In 1881 it employed 27 foreign missionaries and 38 native preachers. The total number of communicants was 1,253, and of probationers 726. It carries on 14 day schools, with an attendance of 800.

The American Baptist Mission was begun in 1835; is interested more especially in the Telugu, of whom there are 15,000,000, whose district lies on the eastern coast, and stretches nearly eight hundred miles, south of the northern borders of the Carnatic to Orissa. In 1854 this society had one station, two missionaries, nine communicants, and carries on its work through 30 American, 15 native preachers, and 48 unordained native preachers, with 1,916 church-members and 1,307 probationers. Its day schools number 242, with an attendance of 8,500 scholars. The Conference of South India was organized in 1876, and consists of four districts,—Bombay, Madras, Calcutta, and Allahabad. In 1881 it employed 27 foreign missionaries and 38 native preachers. The total number of communicants was 1,253, and of probationers 726. It carries on 14 day schools, with an attendance of 800.
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in the Brahman's mind. "It is difficult for us Europeans," said Professor Monier Williams of Oxford, in 1879, "to understand how the pride of the true religion, are to him the very essence of his whole being of a Hindu. He looks upon caste as his veritable god; and those caste-rules which we believe to be a hindrance to his adoption of the true religion, are to him the very essence of his whole life and conduct." Henry Martyn said, "If I ever see a Hindu Brahman converted to Jesus Christ, I shall see something more nearly approaching the essential of the native convert than anything I have ever yet seen." Up to the year 1849 converts were not to exclusion from the society of the caste, but to confiscations of property. But in that year a law was established, giving equal rights to all subjects, and protecting converts against confiscations. Not a few Brahmins are active and influential Christians; but the great mass of the converts have been, as was to be expected, from the lower classes. The other obstacles to missionary progress have been of the same general character as those met with in other lands.

The progress of the gospel in India for the first fifty years was slow, when we look at the number of native baptisms; but within the whole period remarkable changes have been effected in the habits of thought and social condition of the people; and, within the last few years, evidence has been furnished, in the large accessions to the churches, that the patient and faithful labors of the missionaries had been laying deep and permanent foundations. In 1851 there were 17,000 baptized and 128,000 native nominal Christians in India, with 357 foreign missionaries. In 1861 the number had increased to 48,000 baptized and 213,000 nominal Christians; in 1871, to 78,000 baptized and 318,000 nominal Christians. In 1882 there were not less than 300,000 or 300,000 nominal Christians, with 689 foreign missionaries, and many self-supporting native churches. The additions to the churches within the last three years have been exceedingly numerous. The great famine which prevailed in 1879, and which, according to the London Times, carried off 3,000,000 in the province of Madras alone, afforded an occasion for the display of Christian charity. The bountiful distributions of aid won the hearts of the natives, who flocked to the churches; and 16,000 were added in Tinnevelly alone. In this period (1877-79) the number of converts under the care of the five Lutheran societies rose from 3,000 to 42,000. The ten Presbyterian missions of Scotland, Ireland, America, and England, from 1850 to 1878, increased their native constituency from 800 to 10,000; the London Missionary Society, from 20,000 to 48,000; and the Church Missionary Society and Propagation Society, from 81,000 to 180,000 (Christian: Foreign Missions, p. 153). The early progress was amidst discouragements, but the recent acclimations have outpaced those of earlier days. There are now at least 4,000 baptized converts under the care of the English and German societies. The London and Propagation Societies labored for three years at Cuddapah in the Telugu district, with only 200 converts; but now they have 11,000. These, with the case of the American Telugu mission above referred to, are but illustrations of the discouragements and encouragements of the work.

The beneficent influence of missions is apparent in the abolition of superstitious and cruel customs, the increase of intelligence, the diffusion of a literature in almost all the native languages, and in a general leavening process, which has affected a large part of the Indian society of the upper classes. In the work of suppressing superstitious and cruel customs, the government has done much; but even this activity can be clearly traced to the influence of missions in India. The abolition of the suttee by Lord Bentinck has already been referred to; and to this same class of reforms belong the suppression of the annual holocausts under Juggernaut's car, and the practice of infanticide, and the throwing of infants into the Ganges, as a religious service. On the other hand, the change which is slowly taking place in the position of woman is due entirely to the missionaries, especially to the efforts of female missionaries. These gain admittance to the seclusion of the zenanas, and give instruction to the superstitious and unfortunate women of India. The government does not directly give the weight of its influence on the side of missions; but rather, on the contrary, it impedes the progress of the gospel by the rigid exclusion of religious instruction from the government schools. The printing-press has been introduced by missionary enterprise into almost every large centre of influence. The first newspaper established was the Sândcak Darpan at Serampore, in 1818, by the Baptist mission. Not only have the papers under the control of the missionaries and the English multiplied greatly, but a native periodical literature has grown up, which owes its origin to a feeling of the necessity of combating Christianity in this way. The Bible has been translated entire into many of the languages, and ponderous libraries have already been printed in them.

The promotion of education as a means of reaching the people has been vigorously pushed. It may be a fair question whether the missionaries have not devoted relatively too much time to the schoolroom. By that as it may, however, there is to-day a cordon of schools in the cities and larger towns of the Indian Empire. The government now conducts an extensive plan of education; but it got the impetus from the large advantages which it was apparent were accruing from the mission schools (art. India in Encyc. Britan.). In 1854 it established universities in Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay. The government schools are divorced from religion. The mission schools directly or indirectly teach the gospel; and the education of women has progressed slowly. In 1861 there were 60,600 boys and 16,008 girls in the mission schools of India. In 1871 the numbers had risen to 95,500 boys and 26,600 girls. The writer in the Encyclopaedia Britannica (p. 775), above referred to, says, "In a few exceptional places, e.g., Tinnevelly, Madras, and the hills of Assam, female education has a real existence; for in these places the missionaries have
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influence enough to overcome the prejudices of the people." In 1878 there were 66,600 girls attending schools for girls, and 90,000 boys and girls attending the mixed schools.

The power of Christian missions in India has been further demonstrated by the new religious movements which have been begun to check its progress, or at any rate to find a mean between the superstitions of the native religions and the supernatural element of Christianity. The Brahmo Somaj (see art.) inaugurated by Keshub Chunder Sen is the principal of this class. These movements betray the unrest of the people, their growing discontent with their native religions, and longing for something purer and more rational. The dissolution of the Brahmo Somaj has already begun; and Keshub Chunder Sen was obliged long ago to acknowledge that 'native society is being roused, enlightened, and reformed under the influence of Christianity.' In a public speech at Calcutta he has said, "Our hearts are touched, conquered, overcome, by a higher power; and this power is Christ. Christ, not the British Government, rules India. No one but Christ has deserved the precious diadem of the Indian crown, and he will have it." These words of this remarkable man may be regarded as prophetic of the issue of the movement which was begun by Schwartz, Carey, and Martyn. Christianity—which rings the death-knell to caste, suppresses infanticide, abolishes child-marriages, takes woman out of the degrading seclusion of the zenana, promotes culture, and builds up homes—has commenced itself as the power for the regeneration of the land by the testimony of English civilians and native scholars, as well as in its fruits in the changed lives of its converts, and will prevail.


INDIANS. See Appendix.

INDUCTION denotes, as the term is used in the Church of England, the formal installation, in accordance with the mandate of the bishop, of a clerk, already instituted, in possession of a benefice. The act is generally performed by the dean, who accompanies the clerk to the church, places his hand on the key of the church-door, and says to him, "By virtue of this mandate I do induct you into the real, actual, and corporal possessions of this church of Christ, with all the rights, profits, and appurtenances thereto belonging." The clerk then opens the door, enters the church, and tolls a bell, to make his induction known to the parishioners, after which the inductor inducts the certificate of induction on the mandate of the bishop.

INDULGENCES (Indulgentia), an institution peculiar to the Roman Church, originated from confession. In order to make the absolution effective, the sacrament of confession must comprise, besides contritio cordis and confesio oris, also satisfactio: and this satisfaction consists chiefly in so-called good works, penances, by which the wrongs done are paid for. In the old church the amount of satisfactio was measured by the time alone during which the state of penitence should last. But gradually the custom grew up of substituting specific good works, such as pilgrimages, alms, etc., for the general state of penitence; and an elaborate scheme of accounts was drawn up, by which the penances were transformed into money-payments, varying according to the wealth or poverty of the sinner. On the basis of this practice the scholastic theology developed its doctrine of indulgentia: it was completed by Thomas Aquinas, and retained unchanged by the Council of Trent.

With respect to the natural consequences of sin, such as disease, infamy, etc., the Roman Church does not pretend to possess any power; but with respect to those punishments which God inflicts on sinners, either in this world or in purgatory, she claims to have absolute jurisdiction conferred upon her by Christ, with the power of the keys; and the Council of Trent fulminated its anathema against any one who should venture on a denial. If, now, the Church should remit those punishments from mere mercy, and without any satisfactio, she would violate the divine justice, which demands that every sin shall be balanced by a good work. But how, then, does the indulgentia of the Church enter into the transaction? Partly through the doctrine of good works as opera operata, that is, as values which can be transferred from one to another; and partly through the doctrine of commutatio sanctorum, or the co-ownership of the Church in the inexhaustible fund of good works which Christ and the saints have left, and of which they have no need themselves. The trustee of these funds—this thesaurus meritorum, thesaurus supererogationis perfecto—itis the Pope; and he can give or sell from these funds to any one just such an amount of good work as is necessary to counterbalance a certain quantity of sin. See Alexander Hale: Summa supplement, p. 3, Justus Ziegler: Summa, p. 4, quest. 23, art. 2, number 5; and Thomas Aquinas: Summa supplementum, p. 3, quest. 25, c. 28 X.

As a reminiscence of the discipline of the ancient Church, indulgences are still granted for days, months, and years. They are either complete (indulgentia plenaria) or partial (indulgentia minus plena): either general, for the whole church; or particular, for a special diocese. The most general indulgence granted by the Roman Church is that of her jubilee. The whole department of indulgences is administered by a special congregation of cardinals; but the Quaestiones Exemmariorum, or travelling agents, have been abolished.
INFALLIBILITY.

It was the sale of indulgences in Germany, by Tetzel, which first roused the indignation of Luther, and opened the Reformation. See Luther, 277.

INFALLIBILIST. INFALLIBILITY.

Papal infallibility was the chief topic of the Vatican Council: it was discussed under powerful opposition for several months. When the vote was first taken in secret session (July 18, 1870), six hundred and one members being present, four hundred and fifty-one bishops voted in the affirmative (placet), eighty-eight in the negative (non placet), sixty-two voted with a qualification (placet justa modum), and over eighty, though present in Rome, abstained from voting.

On the evening of the same day the minority, which included the ablest and most influential prelates (as Darboy of Paris, Schwarzenberg of Prague, Rauscher of Vienna, Dupliclou of Orleans, Förster of Breslau, Ketteler of Mayence, Strossmayer of Bosnia, Hefele of Rottenburg, Kenrick of St. Louis), sent a deputation to the Pope, and begged him on their knees to modify the proposed decree, and to make some concession for the peace and unity of the Church. But Pius IX. surprised the deputation with the assurance that the Church had always believed in the unconditional infallibility of the Pope ("I am the tradition".) In the secret session of July 18, on motion of some Spanish bishop, an addition was inserted, declaring the Pope infallible before and without the consent of the Church (noum autem ex consensi ecclesiae). On the 17th of July, fifty-six bishops, opposed to the dogma, sent a written protest to the Pope, declaring their firm adherence to their conviction, but also their reluctance to vote against him on a matter affecting him personally, and asking leave to return home. On the evening of the same day, the signers of this protest, and sixty additional members of the opposition, left Rome (taking advantage of the rumblings of war), and thus gave to the majority. In the public session, held July 18, there were but five hundred and thirty-five members present, and all voted placet except two (Bishop Riccio of Sicily, and Bishop Fitzgerald of Little Rock, Ark., who dared to protest against the Big Rock of Rome); but these two changed their vote before the close of the session.

After the vote, the Pope, amidst a fearful thunderstorm and flashes of lightning, read by candlelight, in St. Peter's Cathedral, the decree of his own infallibility. This war in a few weeks swept away both his throne and that of the Pope, and resulted in the unification of Italy, with Rome for its capital, and the establishment of the German Empire under the lead of Protestant Prussia. The proclamation of this new dogma is the cause of the cessation of the "Old Catholics," under the leadership of Dollinger (hitherto the pride of the Roman Church in Germany) and other eminent Catholic scholars. It is also the cause of the renewal of the serious conflict between the Pope and the Emperor (the Culturkampf, the Falk Laws, Bismarck's refusal to go to Canossa), and of a similar conflict between the Pope and the French Republic, which arose on the ruins of the empire.
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The Vatican dogma is the apex of the pyramid of the Roman hierarchy. Logically it is more consistent than the Gallican theory, as an absolute monarchy is more consistent than a constitutional monarchy. It teaches an unbroken and ever-active infallibility; while Gallicanism secures only a periodic and intermittent infallibility, which never reveals itself except in an occasional council. But neither theory can stand the test of history, and is a mere pretension. The sixth ecumenical council (held in Constantinople 680) condemned and excommunicated Pope Honorius I. (625-638) "as a heretic (Monothelite), who, with the help of the old serpent, had scattered deadly error." This anathema was solemnly repeated by the seventh and by the eighth ecumenical councils (787 and 869), and even by the popes themselves, who, down to the eleventh century, in a solemn oath at their accession, indorsed the sixth council, qualified, and denounced "an eternal anathema" on the authors of the Monothelite heresy, together with Pope Honorius, "because he had given aid and comfort to the perverse doctrines of the heretics." This papal oath was probably prescribed by Gregory II. at the beginning of the eighth century, and was found in the Liber diurnus and Liber pontificatus down to the eleventh century. Even the editions of the Roman Breviary, before the sixteenth century, reiterated the charge of heresy against Honorius. Pope Leo II. strongly confirmed the decree of the council against his predecessor Honorius, and denounced him as one who "endeavored by profane treason to overthrow the immaculate faith of the Roman Church" (qui hanc apostolicae ecclesiae non apostolicae traditionis doctrina lastravit, sed profana proditio immaculatam fidem subvertere contaverat est). See Mansi, Concilia, Tom. XI. p. 731. Now, either the council, or the Pope, or both, must have erred. The stubborn case of dogma (forsifalsus in omnis, falsus in omnibus), was strongly urged before the passage of the decree who, with the help of the old serpent, had scattered deadly error. This anathema was solemnly repeated by the seventh and by the eighth ecumenical councils (787 and 869), and even by the popes themselves, who, down to the eleventh century, in a solemn oath at their accession, indorsed the sixth council, qualified, and denounced "an eternal anathema" on the authors of the Monothelite heresy, together with Pope Honorius, "because he had given aid and comfort to the perverse doctrines of the heretics." This papal oath was probably prescribed by Gregory II. at the beginning of the eighth century, and was found in the Liber diurnus and Liber pontificatus down to the eleventh century. Even the editions of the Roman Breviary, before the sixteenth century, reiterated the charge of heresy against Honorius. Pope Leo II. strongly confirmed the decree of the council against his predecessor Honorius, and denounced him as one who "endeavored by profane treason to overthrow the immaculate faith of the Roman Church" (qui hanc apostolicae ecclesiae non apostolicae traditionis doctrina lastravit, sed profana proditio immaculatam fidem subvertere contaverat est). See Mansi, Concilia, Tom. XI. p. 731. Now, either the council, or the Pope, or both, must have erred. The stubborn case of dogma (for si falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus), was strongly urged before the passage of the decree by learned members of the council, as Bishop Hefele and Kenrick; and their arguments have never been refuted. But a dogma triumphed over history. If facts are against opinion (it was said by the infallibilists), all the worse for the facts.

History knows other heretical popes. Zephyrinus (201-219) and Callistus (219-229) were Patripassians; Liberius (358) signed an Arian creed, and condemned Athanasius, "the father of orthodoxy," who mentions the fact with indignation; Felix II. was a decided Arian; Zosimus (417) at first indorsed the heresy of Pelagius and Caelestius, whom his predecessor, Innocent I., had condemned; Vigilius (538-555) vacillated between two opposite decisions during the Three Chapter Controversy, and thereby produced a long schism in the West; John XXII. (d. 1334) denounced a certain opinion of Nicholas III. and Clement V. as heretical; several popes taught the universal depravity of men in a manner that clearly includes the Virgin Mary, and is irreconcilable with the recent dogma of the immaculate conception; Sixtus V. issued an edition of the Latin Bible with innumerable blunders, partly of his own making, as declared it the only true authentic text. Bellarmin, the great Roman controversialist and infallibilist, could not deny the facts, and advised the printing of a new edition with the bold statement in the preface, charging the errors of the infallible Pope upon the fallible printer, though the Pope had himself corrected the proofs. Pius IX., who proclaimed his own infallibility, started out as a political reformer, and advocate of Italian unity, but afterwards detested and condemned it as the worst enemy of Christianity. But since 1870 Gallicanism is dead, and the Roman Church must sink or swim with an infallible pope.


INFANT COMMUNION. See BAPTISM or INFANTS.

INFANT COMMUNION, or the dispensing of the elements to actual babes and to very young children. The first trace of this custom is found in Cyprian (third century), who, in his treatise On the Lapsed, represents infants as saying, on the day of judgment, "We have not forsaken the Lord's bread and cup" (De lapsis, c. ix.); and in the same book he tells a striking story, how an infant refused the cup, and, when the deacon forced it down her throat, she was seized with vomiting. The explanation was, that the child, unknown to her parents, had previously, while under the care of her nurse, eaten bread soaked in wine which had been poured out at an idolatrous ceremony (De lapsis, c. xxv.). The custom of infant communion was indeed universal at that time; communion followed baptism. The so-called Liturgy of St. Clement,
INFANT COMMUNION. INFANT SALVATION.

in the Constit. Apost., viii. 18, prescribes, in the order of communicants, the place of the little children (παιδία). Augustine (fifth century) uses this language: "They are infants; but they are made partakers of His table that they may have life in themselves (Serm. 74, § 7). Again: he argues, that, if infants were not born in sin, Christ's words, "Except ye eat the flesh," etc. (John vi. 63), would not be true of them (Contra duas epp. Pelag. i. xxii. § 40). The practice is also proved by regulations respecting its execution; e.g., Gennadius of Marseilles (495), in his De Eccl. dogm., c. 22. The sixth canon of the Council of Macon (585) decrees that the remnants of the consecrated bread, moistened with wine, be distributed every Wednesday or Friday to innocent children, who must receive it fasting. The order, takes the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. They wear a dark-brown dress with a white hood.

INFANT SALVATION, or the salvation of those who die in infancy. The doctrines of infant damnation and of non-elect infants were unknown to the early Church. The fact that the baptism of infants was so commonly postponed to Easter Week proves that it was even not considered any loss to the child to die unbaptized. But, as sacerdotal and ecclesiastical ideas spread in the Church, baptism was more and more emphasized, until Gregory of Nazianzus and Ambrose (fourth century) could say that unbaptized children could not be saved. The first, however, argued, that since they had suffered, and not caused, the loss of baptism, the righteous Judge would not punish them; and Ambrose, while claiming that there could be no exception made for them on account of their infancy, yet thought they would be free from pain. It was left to Augustine to teach the damnation of infants. But their sufferings, though eternal, are bearable, being of the mildest character (De pecc. meriti., i. c. xvi.). He also opposed the idea of an intermediate state in which these infants were. Pelagius, whom Augustine so vigorously opposed, expressed no decided opinion upon this point, but said, "Whither they may not go, I know: whither they may go, I do not know." Their punishment must, he thought, be of the mildest sort, since they had not committed any actual transgression, and had no original sin: indeed, he was ready to confess it seemed to him doubtful whether they were punished at all. The Roman Church, accepting Augustine's conceptions of the necessity of baptism to salvation, and of the mildness of the punishment of those infants who died unbaptized, agreed with him that they were sent to hell, and assigned to them a separate place in it, the limbus infantum, or puérorum. (See Thomas Aquinas's Sum. Theol. Mor. iii. c. ix. B. iii. 2; Suppl., q. lxxi. 7; also Dante: Inferno, canto iv.). There is, however, a difference of opinion in this Church as to the character of their sufferings, whether it is actual (poena sensus), or only a deprivation of the vision of God (carentia visionis Dei). In the Council of Trent, in its twenty-first session, the Catholic Church condemned the opinion that the infants who died unbaptized went to a separate place in purgatory. The Church in the East, of giving the consecrated elements to blameless young persons, was paralleled in the West by the distribution of the so-called eulogia, i.e., that portion of the Eucharist which was conveyed by the hands of the deacons to those who were absent, and, later on, by the practice of giving children the bread and wine before consecration. The custom of infant communion died out in the West; and the Council of Trent, in its twenty-first session, declared, in the name of the Church, that for these reasons the custom was to be condemned. The giving of the unconsecrated elements to children. The Greek Church to-day, and also the Nestorians, Jacobites, Armenians, and Maronites, persist in the practice, using generally only the wine, and giving it either by a spoon or by the finger. All Protestant churches unite in rejecting infant communion.
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INFANT JESUS, The Congregation of the Daughters of the, was founded in Rome, in the latter part of the seventeenth century, by Anna Moroni, as an institution in which poor girls received free instruction in some useful arts, and shortly after transformed into a regular order of the Church by Pope Clement X. The novitiate lasts three years; and the novice, when entering the order, takes the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. They wear a dark-brown dress with a white hood.

INFANT SALVATION, or the salvation of those who die in infancy. The doctrines of infant damnation and of non-elect infants were unknown to the early Church. The fact that the baptism of infants was so commonly postponed to Easter Week proves that it was even not considered any loss to the child to die unbaptized. But, as sacerdotal and ecclesiastical ideas spread in the Church, baptism was more and more emphasized, until Gregory of Nazianzus and Ambrose (fourth century) could say that unbaptized children could not be saved. The first, however, argued, that since they had suffered, and not caused, the loss of baptism, the righteous Judge would not punish them; and Ambrose, while claiming that there could be no exception made for them on account of their infancy, yet thought they would be free from pain. It was left to Augustine to teach the damnation of infants. But their sufferings, though eternal, are bearable, being of the mildest character (De pecc. meriti., i. c. xvi.). He also opposed the idea of an intermediate state in which these infants were. Pelagius, whom Augustine so vigorously opposed, expressed no decided opinion upon this point, but said, "Whither they may not go, I know: whither they may go, I do not know." Their punishment must, he thought, be of the mildest sort, since they had not committed any actual transgression, and had no original sin: indeed, he was ready to confess it seemed to him doubtful whether they were punished at all. The Roman Church, accepting Augustine's conceptions of the necessity of baptism to salvation, and of the mildness of the punishment of those infants who died unbaptized, agreed with him that they were sent to hell, and assigned to them a separate place in it, the limbus infantum, or puérorum. (See Thomas Aquinas's Sum. Theol. Mor. iii. c. ix. B. iii. 2; Suppl., q. lxxi. 7; also Dante: Inferno, canto iv.). There is, however, a difference of opinion in this Church as to the character of their sufferings, whether it is actual (poena sensus), or only a deprivation of the vision of God (carentia visionis Dei). In the Council of Trent, the Dominicans and Franciscans contradicted each other. The
former held that these lost infants were in a dark subterranean region without fire; the latter, that they were above the earth and in the light. Others spoke yet more cheerfully of their condition, supposing them to be occupied with the study of nature, and to be occasionally recipients of the visits of angels and saints. The council refused to commit itself to a decision, though affirming the necessity of baptism (Sess. v. 4); and, since then, some theologians have followed Peter Lombard in the supposition that they suffer some sort of misery in punishment of original sin (Bellarmine: De amiss. grat., 6, 6). Others, like Cardinal Sfondrani (Nodus præsent. dissol., 1, 1, 28), have maintained that they enjoy as much happiness as they are capable of. Perrone represents, probably, the prevalent view when he says (5, 275) that they suffer only the lack of the beatific vision: they are in “a condition of pure nature.” And, further, Roman-Catholic theologians teach that the desire for baptism, even on the part of unborn children, is accepted for the baptism itself: therefore, there need be no fears for children of Christians who die in infancy.

The first one to enter the lists against the Roman theory of the necessity of baptism to infant salvation was Zwingli. He taught that all elect children who die in infancy are saved, whether they are baptized or not, whether Pagan or Christian; and, further, that all who die in infancy are elect, since their early death is a token of God’s peculiar mercy, and therefore of their salvation. Luther, on the other hand, taught the necessity of baptism to salvation; and this doctrine is part of the Lutheran creed, involving baptismal regeneration. Calvin held to election in regard to infants, and speaks thus:—

“As to infants, they seem to perish, not by their own fault, but by the fault of another. But there is a double solution. Though sin does not yet appear in them, yet it is latent; for they bear corruption shut up in the soul, so that before God they are damnable.” “That infants who are to be saved (as, certainly, out of that age some are saved) must be previously regenerated by the Lord is clear.” — *Institut.*, iv., xvi. 17.

We find this doctrine of infant salvation through election expressed in the Calvinistic symbols. The *Canons of the Synod of Dort* (1619) declare:—

“Since we are to judge of the will of God from his word (which testifies that the children of believers are holy, not by nature, but in virtue of the covenant of grace, in which they, together with the parents, are comprehended), godly parents have no reason to doubt of the election and salvation of their children whom it pleaseth God to call out of this life in their infancy.” — *First Head of Doctrine*, art. XVII.

And the *Westminster Confession* :—

“The grace promised in baptism is not only offered but really exhibited and conferred, by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God’s own will, in his appointed time.” — XXVIII., vi.

And

“Elect infants dying in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit, who worketh when and where and how he pleaseth.” — X, iii.

But, in the *Second Scotch Confession* (1580), it says,—

“*We abhor and detest the cruel judgment against infants dying without baptism.*” — *See Schaff: Creeds*, vol. iii. p. 483.

Since Calvinists distinguish between elect and non-elect infants, it is not strange that some of their theologians have spoken of the elect and reprobate infants. Thus Musculus says,—

“Since, therefore, this discrimination of elect and reprobate in new-born infants is hidden from our judgment, it is not fitting that we should inquire into it, lest by ignorance we reject vessels of grace.” — *Loci Communes*, 336.

And the Swiss theologians at the Synod of Dort said,—

“That there is an election and reprobation of infants, no less than of adults, we cannot deny in the face of God, who loves and hates unborn children.” — *Acta Synod. Dort. Judic.*, 40.

A proof of the existence of this stern view in Calvinistic New England in the seventeenth century is the passage in that curious poem, *The Day of Doom*, written by Rev. Michael Wigglesworth, which was published in 1662, ran through many editions, and was reprinted as a curiosity, New York, 1867. Among the classes of sinners who make their plea for mercy are the “reprobate infants” who died in infancy,

“But from the womb unto the tomb were straightway carried (Or at the least ere they transgress’d).”

But they are answered like the rest. However, in recognition of their innocence, they are allowed “the easiest room in hell.” Calvinism, by its doctrine of election, rids itself of the stigma of infant damnation; for surely it is allowable to hope, at least, that the grace of election extends to all who die in infancy.

In the seventeenth century, the Arminians resumed Zwingli’s position, and, consistently with their theory that original sin was not punishable apart from actual transgression, taught the general salvation of infants: so do the Methodists and Baptists to-day. On the other hand, the Lutherans, and all others who teach baptismal regeneration, are logically shut up to the view that all who die unbaptized are lost. Also the Rev. John Henry Blunt, in his *Dict. Doc. Theol.*, p. 346, note, speaking, doubtless, for High-churchmen generally, says,—

“It can hardly, I think, be doubted that they do sustain a loss, of whatever kind. In the *Institutions of a Christian Man*, the Church of England declares, ‘Insomuch as infants, and children dying in their infancy, shall undoubtedly be saved thereby (i.e., by baptism), else not.’ In the last revision of the Prayer-book we read, ‘It is certain, by God’s word, that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved.’ In other words, we are certain of the future happiness of the baptized, but have no assurance of the salvation of the unbaptized, infant. The question must thus be left in obscurity, as we have no sufficient warrant to go beyond the cautious statement of our Church.”
INFANTICIDE.

But the heart is stronger than logic. The tendency is towards milder views; and it may well be questioned if there be a single living Lutheran in Germany who confines the grace of salvation to baptized infants. So, also, the Calvinists speak. Thus Dr. Charles Hodge, whose orthodoxy is unquestioned, teaches emphatically the salvation of all infants who die in infancy, and asserts that this is the “common doctrine of evangelical Protestants” (Systematic Theology, i. 26).

It will thus be seen, from this review of opinions upon this subject, that there has been recent progress. We now believe that God’s grace has been extended to all lands, and are ready to say that infants of heathens, no less than of Christians, enter heaven through the blood of Christ. Surely, He who said, “Suffer the little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven,” shuts the kingdom of heaven in no infant’s face.


INFANTICIDE, the practice of murdering newborn children, has been known from early times, and amongst cultivated as well as barbarous nations. It has taken the form of a religious custom, as among the worshippers of Moloch, “horrid king,” who threw their children as sacrifices into his molten arms, and the Hindus, who cast their children into the Ganges. We first meet with the practice of abnormal or murderous infanticide at Sparta, where it was enjoined by the laws of Lycurgus. Weakly or deformed infants were exposed to die on Mount Taygetos, on the ground that they would be of service to the State. In Rome the practice prevailed to a large degree during the imperial period, when the marriage-vow was not regarded as binding, and Roman ladies counted their years by the number of their divorces (Seneca). Some of the first men of antiquity commended the practice, as Aristotle (Repub., vii. 16) and Pliny the elder. Seneca and other Roman satirists bear witness to the wide extent of its prevalence. The custom has also prevailed among the peoples of Hindustan, the Chinese, the Society and other groups of islands in the Pacific, some of the Indian tribes (Alaska), and in other parts of the world. The Mahometans also practise the custom of murdering girls at their birth. The motives which have impelled parents to murder their children have been considerations of civil obligation (Sparta), shame, disinclination to rear children, and poverty.

Latterly, the policy of the Christian emperors, beginning with Constantine, provided statutes looking to the care of children exposed by their parents to death. In the fifth century the custom was in vogue of laying such children at the church-doors (Conc. Arles 11. can. 51, 453). By the eighth century, asylums were established in many parts of Christendom, and other cities, for the care and training of deserted children; and the Church granted to them hypothetical baptism (Si non es baptizatus, etc., “If thou art not baptized,” etc.). At a much later period in the seventeenth century, St. Vincent de Paul directed his energies to the relief of this class of persons, with great zeal. The last century and the first part of this have witnessed the establishment of many foundling asylums in the different countries of Europe. In England severe laws have been passed, punishing with penal servitude and other penalties the murder of children after and before their birth. In France a great increase in the number of foundlings is supposed to have followed upon the use of the tour, or revolving box, which was so arranged that the depositor might leave the infant in the box without himself becoming exposed. By a simple turn of the box from within, the child was drawn inside the building. In 1833 this arrangement was abolished, and the number of foundlings decreased from thirty-five thousand in 1832 to twenty-six thousand in 1838. A hospital in Dublin, also, used a box of this description till 1826, when it was ordered removed by Parliament.

All nations of Southern Europe, except Greece, and including Austria, have permitted the use of the box. According to Von Oettingen (Moralstatistik) the number of foundling asylums in France is a hundred and one, Spain forty-nine, Austria thirty-six, etc. In the United States such asylums are comparatively rare. The principal Roman-Catholic institution of the kind is the New-York Foundling Asylum, at the corner of Lexington Avenue and Sixty-sixth Street, New-York City. There are two Protestant (undenominational) institutions in New-York City,—the New-York Infant Asylum, and the Infants’ Home and Day Nursery (established 1854). Both of these institutions give shelter to the mothers during their confinement, and urge them to remain for a period with their children. The results have been satisfactory, both in saving the mothers from a continued life of shame, and in preserving the lives of the children (about eighty per cent).


INFIDELITY. In this article, infidelity is used to denote the denial of the claims of Christianity as a divine revelation. In this sense it is not quite the same with unbelief; for unbelief equally takes in other negative positions, such as atheism: and it is not quite the same with scepticism, as this involves the deeper philosophical principles, and that nothing is or can be known. Still, unbelief may be used to include infidelity, all the more that negative views as to God’s existence, or personality, or character, also tend to cut off faith in a revelation of his will; and in like manner scepticism, having the same result, may with proper distinction be used as a synonym. It also to be added that the word “infidelity” carries with
it a shade of censure. It is not ignorance, or simple blindness of Christianity, that is asserted, but rejection; which the Christian Church holds to be sinful. As faith is a duty, and as those nominal Christians who come short of it, in not personally accepting Christ as a Saviour, are condemned, so those who carry their repulsion farther, even to denial of his mission and of the authority of his word, must be still more blameworthy.

The causes of infidelity, though manifold and subtle, may be briefly indicated. They are of two kinds, — subjective and objective. The former lies in the prejudices against Christianity that are found within; the latter, in the scandals and hindrances that come from without. Of prejudices, the chief are moral, being found in the lusts and passions which the gospel condemns, or, where these do not rule, in the pride and self-righteousness which cannot be renounced, or in the want of that loving and tender spirit without which Christ's kingdom is only a name; so that even the better class of unbelievers find uncongenial to them the lofty devotion to the glory of God, and the humbling sense of sin, in which the very soul of Christianity consists. With these moral prejudices intellectual ones may concur, such as mistakes of Christians in dealing with infidelity, or the doctrine of Christianity,—such as the trinity, or the supernatural, or a bias against some cardinal doctrines of Christianity,—such as the trinity, or the atonement, or the influence of the Holy Spirit. Under the head of scandals fall all the misrepresentations of Christianity which exist in doctrine and life,—the corruptions and divisions of churches, the sins of Christian nations, the slow progress and limited success of the gospel through the fault of its supporters, and even the mistakes of Christians in dealing with infidelity itself. With these causes at work amidst a race, which, as Christians believe, is ungodly and fallen, it is not wonderful, that, as there has been always so much practical unbelief in the world, a which, as Christians believe, is ungodly and unchristian, it is not surprising that the controversy has not died out. These causes are not peculiar to the modern infidelity, but are found in the ancient infidelity also. They are of two kinds,—subjective and objective. The former lies in the prejudices against Christianity that are found within; the latter, in the scandals and hindrances that come from without. Of prejudices, the chief are moral, being found in the lusts and passions which the gospel condemns, or, where these do not rule, in the pride and self-righteousness which cannot be renounced, or in the want of that loving and tender spirit without which Christ's kingdom is only a name; so that even the better class of unbelievers find uncongenial to them the lofty devotion to the glory of God, and the humbling sense of sin, in which the very soul of Christianity consists.

In sketching the history of infidelity, it will be necessary to divide it into two great periods, the ancient and the modern, which are found to differ not only in time, but in character. The ancient infidelity meets the Christian religion at its birth, and continues until the fall of Paganism, opposing the gospel from the ground of false religion, or professed revelation of some kind or other; whereas the modern infidelity has more and more detached itself, since the Reformation, from all belief in the supernatural, or at least in any revelation of which the claims can be upheld against Christianity. This classification, indeed, is not strictly correct; for there were earlier opponents of Christianity, like Lucian, who anticipated the more negative and anti-supernaturalist style of more recent centuries, as, indeed, this necessarily followed from the sceptical and Epicurean philosophy. But the most influential antagonists of Christianity all wrote in the interests of the popular religion, however spiritualized, and did not reject Christianity because it was a revelation, but because it set aside other and better-warranted revelations, like those of Paganism. It is only on the mission-field that Chris-
more special doctrines of Christianity, such as the atonement and the new birth, Celsus hardly sees, and therefore he hardly assails them. It is still to him the exitibilis superstitio of Tacitus, brought a good deal nearer, and in proportion more hateful. Still it is wonderful, within his own range, that Celsus sees so much, and has anticipated so much, of the coarser style of attack on Christianity. The copyists of Scripture and its plagiarisms from Plato and the philosophers; the divisions and strifes of Christians; the want of patriotism and public spirit, with a general ridiculous narrowness and fanaticism,—these are his characteristic contribution to the reproaches of ages.

Nor has he made one single concession, or written one redeeming sentence; so that his great services to Christian apologists, in his admissions as to the dates of sacred books, and other facts, are wholly involuntary. It has been the function of Christianity to train even its opponents to seize something of its own point of view. But to this Celsus is the ideal opponent; and the contrast is most complete in his great antagonist Origen, who, in meeting Celsus, has met the best who have followed him, and has made this first still the most fruitful and suggestive of all apologetic controversies.

Porphyry, though a much abler man than Celsus, and a more voluminous writer against Christianity, exists in much scantier fragments; so that little is added from him to the stock of argument. He was a native of Tyre, born about 233 A.D., and was the companion, biographer, and expositor of Plotinus, the founder of the Neo-Platonic philosophy. In him and in his party this system of mystic idealism, opposed to Christianity by its radical exclusion of the incarnation, was further bent into hostility by its effort to spiritualize the current Paganism, and maintain its influence. This, doubtless, lent a color to the elaborate work of Porphyry against the Christians (called also of fifteen books), which was written about the year 270. But as the lengthened replies to this work, including that of Eusebius the church historian, have perished, we cannot trace its sequence, or even its characteristic features. He seems more than Celsus to have gone into detailed criticism of the Old and New Testament Scriptures; and hence the attacks on the prophecies of Daniel, which are hinted at in this treatise; but the whole strain is satirical and derisive, as towards a religion which boasted such great things, and yet shut itself up in a corner of the world.

From the fall of Paganism to the Reformation the conflict with infidelity ceases, or is only prolonged by other weapons than those of controversy. Mohammedanism comes on the scene, retorting on its opponents the reproach of being infidels; but this leads to no collision of argument, but of sterner combat. At length the Reformation in the Western Church appears, and this, from a Roman-Catholic point of view, might be regarded as unbelief; but Protestantism disowns the name, and though cut off from the Christian pale, yet, by its witness for the Bible and for the authority of Christ, hindered even Rome from branding its career as the same with that of infidelity. It is not till the Reformation, that in lands professively Christian, whether Catholic or Protestant, a phenomenon truly entitled to the name of infidelity arises, and...
that with such new features as to stand distinct from the Pagan unbelief of the early centuries. Of this, as already stated, the marked feature, though it comes slowly and hesitatingly to light, is the denial of all revelation, and the confinement of whatever religion is still retained, be it much or little, (Edictus, 1670); so long as he professed theism (Tractatus Theologico-Politicus, 1670), he recalls Hobbes at least in his founding of right on power, and in his free and rationalizing strain of Scripture criticism. Many of Spinoza's hypotheses in excluding the miraculous are as arithmetical as those of Hobbes; but his schemes and theories have been still more influential, and are to this day widely current. His pantheism does not require to be here noticed, as lying beyond our definition of infidelity. It is important, however, to consider how much there is of lingering sympathy with the Christian view of the exalted character of Christ, all the more remarkable as coming from a Jew, though the radical pantheism and anti-supernaturalism of his system bar the just influence of this real element. The sceptical side of this early period is represented by Bayle (1647–1706), whose Huguenot extraction, and temporary conversion to Romanism, so far determine the type of his hostility to Christian faith. A professor in Protestant seminaries like Sedan and Rotterdam, void of all sympathy with the Reformed creed, save on the side of culture and liberty, his life becomes one long critical process without earnestness or fruit, save only as the debates of all systems with each other are recorded. This is the work of his Dictionary, published in 1697, and for the next century a storehouse of negative criticism and a forerunner of the French Encyclopédie; only that Bayle is more fair in dealing out doubts and difficulties all round, so that orthodoxy merely shares in the general weakness of the human mind.

It is apparent that this earliest period of modern doubt contained all the internal conflicts and discords that were afterwards to be developed, and which have made it strong for attack on Christianity, but feebly in supplying its place. All comes more to light in the next century, when infidelity gains more full expression and power. This brings with it the three national and mutually related movements in England, France, and Germany.

English deism springs up on the soil of religious decay and latitude and of political freedom, not without help from the Socinian tendency which had clung as a shade to the Reformation, and with its waning light gained in influence. The deistic movement stands out as the first combined protest of educated thought in Europe against Christianity; and therefore its history is all the more instructive, and its failure confirmatory of faith. It fills up the space from the Revolution to the rise of Methodism and the reawakening of religious life in England. Its earlier struggles are more desultory and miscellaneous; its later, more concentrated and definite.

To the former belongs Charles Blount, whose Oracles of Reason, published in 1685, after his death, discloses the fact that the name "Deists" had been taken by the party which traced itself to Herbert, and who, in an earlier work (1680) on Apollonius of Tyana, had, apparently without knowing it, renewed the effort of Hierocles to account on natural principles for the career of Jesus Christ. Another miscellaneous writer, of Irish birth, is Toland (1670–1722), who, in his Christianity not Mysterious, too, long after the nature of mysteries, then maintains in his Amaryst the looseness of the canon, drawing forth the masterly work of Lardner, and after other fugitive pieces, still professing something of Christianity, ends in 1720 by publishing anonymously a confession of pantheism, which was certainly, though balanced by another work of a contrary tenor in the same year. We may perhaps include here also Lord Shaftesbury, whose Characteristics (1711) contain strictures on the moral aspects of Christianity hardly consistent with his profession.
of belief, and certainly Anthony Collins (1676–1729), whose first appearance in connection with this controversy, in his *Discourse on Freethinking* (1713), is little more than a clever burlesque, designed, without any scientific method, to put Christians on the same ground of ultimate dependence on reason with the rising sect of free-thinkers, though this manifesto more than met its match in the learning, argument, and wit of Bentley.

The most important period in the deistic movement, that which deals more with definite topics, falls under the Hanoverian dynasty; and this is led in by Collins, whose work on prophecy, *The Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion* (1724), is more solid and serious than his first, though marked also by a one-sidedness and controversial art above which he never rose. The aim of this treatise was to show that prophecy had only been meant, and only fulfilled, analogically, that is, not at all; and his conflict between him and Bishop Chandler and his many other opponents turned on the criticism of texts, and the evidence of their accomplishment. He replied to the bishop in his *Scheme of Literal Prophecy considered* (1727), but somewhat changed his ground without acknowledging it. He has anticipated modern criticism as to Daniel, but is out of harmony with it in denying all early Messianic hopes and traditions.

The discussion on prophecy gave birth to that on miracles, which was conducted by Thomas Woolston, an ex-fellow of Sidney College, Cambridge (1667–1733). As Collins had reduced prophecy, so Woolston reduced miracle, to allegory, and denied the literal facts. His *Discourses on the Miracles of our Saviour* (1727–30), though reaching a sale of thirty thousand copies, are now generally discredited for their violent and uncritical spirit, which may be judged of by his asserting a compact between the disciples and Jewish rulers, which the former violated by stealing the Saviour's body. It would have been well had Woolston been replied to only in works like Bishop Sherlock's *Trial of the Witnesses*, but, unhappily, he was fined and imprisoned, and died in restraint.

The central passage of this controversy was the debate on the possibility and credibility of revelation. This arose with Matthew Tindal (1656–1733), an ex-fellow of All Souls', Oxford, who had in his youth gone over to Pury, and then recollected to a different extreme. His work, *Christianity as Old as the Creation* (1730), was mainly designed to set aside revelation by building on the law of nature, or equal relation of God to his creatures at all times. This was answered best of all by Conybeare (1732), that the law of nature left room for the progressive light of nature, and that, without exception, it might take the form of revelation, and attest itself to the inward eye, without being absolutely the same with natural data. To this writer also, more than to any other, Butler, in his *Analogy* (1738), replied, without naming him, by showing that objections to the limits of God's power, or exceptions to the evidence of revelation struck equally at natural religion. With the defeat of Tindal, the deistic conflict slackened, and no equal work appeared.

Thomas Chubb (1679–1747), glove-maker in Salisbury, with considerable force of untrained faculties, mingled repeatedly in the controversy, though at first more as a Socinian, till in his last work he assails the morality of the New Testament, and seems to give up all Christ's historic claims. With his assault on morality in its Christian shape might seem to agree the work published in 1737, *The Moral Philosopher*, known to be by Thomas Morgan, a dissipated dissenting minister, who died in 1743. But Morgan only assails the Old Testament, allows the sinlessness of Christ, and acknowledges the greatness of Paul; though, like the Tubingen school, he separates between him and the Jewish apostles, and even regards the Apocalypse as a protest against him. Morgan's antipathy to the Old Testament has been supposed to have called forth Warburton's *Divine Legation of Moses*; but this was meditated and partly written before.

The English deism, as Leckier has well shown, had a tendency to scepticism. which he is probably wrong in supposing that our next writer created any epoch. This was Henry Dodwell, the son of the celebrated non-juror of that name, whose *Christianity not Founded on Argument* (1742) is a pretended defence of the gospel as resting on inward light; which, however, is pushed so far as to be caricatured. The necessary limitation, and the vindication of the self-evidencing power of Christianity, was ably given by Philip Doddridge.

A still more sceptical writer, though a professed theist, was Lord Bolingbroke (1678–1751). This eminent statesman had no radical principles in theology; and, without any theory of scepticism, his views as to the divine attributes are radically contradictory, and change whenever Christianity is to be assailed. His posthumous book, in 5 vols. (*Philosophical Works*, 1754), which is largely an attempt to trace Christianity to Platonism, of which he has a dark idea, is a total failure from want of learning (the Platonico authorities being quoted in Latin) and of fairness; and his attacks on the Old Testament are equally violent. There is here the origin of much in Voltaire; but no intelligent opponent could now write in this strain.

The greatest name on the sceptical side, beyond all question, is that of Hume. His *Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* (1748), would, as Mill has conceded, be recalled by restoring the idea of God, not to mention, that, in seeming to argue against the credibility of testimony, he has argued equally against the credibility of sense, and so far begged the question, that miracles are only matters of testimony, and never of experience. Most or exceptions, this might take, in the best reply to Hume,—that by Campbell, *On Miracles* (1762); and Hume has not been generally followed, except by those who deny miracles, not merely as inconceivable, but as impossible.

With Hume, though lying outside of the deistic controversy, we may rank his great contemporary, fellow-historian, Gibbon (1737–94). Gibbon, like Bayle, loses all the earnestness of belief with his return from Romanism; and his *Decline and Fall* shows how deeply insensible he was to the
divine power of Christianity. Yet the work is an involuntary tribute to its greatness; and the attempt, far beyond any thing in deism, to account for it by secondary causes, is an anticipation of more recent efforts, while recognizing its world-historical importance, to bring it within the law of natural developments. In Gibbon, however, here lies beyond even the position of French encyclopedism, of which he was a sympathetic witness, and of this we must now speak.

The national unbelief of France in the last century has been called, from its Encyclopédie (1751-65), "Encyclopedism;" but to Voltaire (1694-1778), more than to any other writer in that work, it is due. The way had been prepared by the immense abuses and corruptions in Church and State, by the quarrels between Jesuitism and Jansenism in the bosom of Rome, and by the absence of Bible and to the character of Christ, however unhappy the tenure of his life, separated himself from every writer of that school. As it was, the encyclopedic movement was only powerful for destruction; and infidelity, in submitting to the return even of Romanism to fresh ascendency, had openly to confess its own weakness.

The movement in Germany called rationalism it has been common to unite with the name of Voltaire that of Rousseau (1712-78); but this has been shown by more careful inquiries to be a mistake. The Swiss writer, in his Contra! Social (1762), had struck a democratic note deeper than any thing in Voltaire; and in his Émile (1762) he had, in the "Profession of Faith," put into the mouth of a Swiss vicar, seemed to share the prevailing doubts as to the evidences of revelation. But, though these and other facts linked Rousseau with revolution, there was a discord with Voltaire more than personal. He eloquently protested against the atheism by which Voltaire suffered himself to be surrounded, strove to explain his own liberties in harmony with belief in Christianity, and in his tributes to the Bible and to the character of Christ, however unhappy the tenor of his life, separated himself from every writer of that school. As it was, the encyclopedic movement was only powerful for destruction; and infidelity, in submitting to the return even of Romanism to fresh ascendency, had openly to confess its own weakness.

The movement in Germany called rationalism was largely derived from English and French sources, but probably much from the decay of Christian faith and life among the German people. The revival, under Spener and Francke, in the beginning of the century, had failed to arrest the downward course of all the old churches of the Reformation; and a cold and scholastic orthodoxy gave way to doubt and negation, as carrying with them apparently more of freshness and interest. A threefold tendency has been here remarked: First, The popular philosophy movement, which, no longer met by the speculative element (as in Leibnitz), was strictly in Voltaire, reduced philosophy to empiricism, and religion to naturalism. Of this school an exaggerated example was C. F. Bahrdt (1741-92). Secondly, The critical school, which, developing the concessions of Baumgarten, Ernesti, and J. D. Michaelis, passed—in the hands of Semler in Halle, Eichhorn in Göttingen, and Paulus in Heidelberg, with many others—to a denial of all distinctive inspiration in the sacred books, and of all special Christian doctrine in their contents, while still exalting Christ as a great Example and Teacher. In one who belonged partly to the popular and partly to the critical school—Reimarus (1694-1768), teacher in the Gymnasium of Hamburg—this minimum of doctrine was not retained; and in his work, published after his death by Lessing as Fragments from the Library of Woflenbüttel (1774-78), the Saviour, though without excellent morality, is treated as a political enthusiast who failed in setting up by his triumphal entry a temporal kingdom, and his disciples as schemers who adapted their theology to the altered circumstances, and stole the body of Jesus to counteract the fraud of a resurrection. Lessing, in publishing these fragments, disclaimed all sympathy with them, as, indeed, his Education of the Human Race (1777-80) is based upon a different principle; but in his replies to Pastor Goetze of Hamburg, and others, who resented his act, he showed himself so much an apologist of Reimarus, and an assailant of the letter of the gospel history, while professing to uphold its spirit, that his relation to Christianity is rendered uncertain. The third school is that of ethical rationalism, represented by Kant and his followers, which finds expression in that philosopher's Religion within the Limits of Mere Reason (1792). Here the weakness of Kant's philosophy, in making the infinite and absolute mere regulative ideas that could not come within the grasp of the finite, is seen; for the incarnation, the keystone of Christianity, is misunderstood, and the historical Christ becomes the mere summary of ethical teaching, whose so-called offices are to be idealized into subjective processes in the heart of the individual, while also connected with a society in which moral results can alone be achieved, but who stands upon the footing of reason and moral law, rather than of redemption and grace in the Christian sense of these terms. Hence, while Kant is the highest summit of rationalism, and even so far the prophet of a return to faith, including a sinless Christ miracle and the basis of incarnation, it remained for another century, under Schleiermacher and his followers, not without their own inconsistencies, to escape from mere nature, and to restore an historical Christianity to its true place.

Such was unbelief at the end of the last century; and, as the present advanced, the demonstrated failure of Spence and Francke, with the re-action in favor of belief, compelled it to assume a more respectful attitude toward
Christianity, and at the same time to attempt more earnestly, on naturalist principles, to solve its origin and history. To this latter task the movement in philosophy and science also urged; and hence unbelief has grappled with this problem under one or other of the reigning tendencies that have divided the century: first, speculative and hence unbelief has applied with this problem; the latter task the Christian faith and at the same time to attempt the agnostic tendency. These types appear successively in the most prominent unbeliever of the nineteenth century, David Friedrich Strauss: in others they are more or less traceable. Strauss passes through three periods, publishing the first edition of his Leben Jesu in 1835, in which he gathers up the hints of earlier critics, like Eichhorn and Gabler, as to a mythical element in the life of Jesus, and explains the facts as stated in the Gospels as unhistorical reflections of the disciples' love and admiration, fashioning their Christ after Messianic traditions and their own fantasies, the only truth being the humanitarianism in him of the Hegelian idea that God and man are one; then, in his recast of this work in 1864, dropping altogether the Hegelian frame, and in the old deistic way treating Jesus as a great personality who realizes the fatherhood of God, while from the school of Bauer tendency is called in to help out the myth; then, lastly, in his Old and New Faith of 1873, not long before his death, going over to the theory of evolutionism in its atheistic shape, and striking out many of his concessions to the character of Jesus: for which, indeed, the work was prepared by his admirable biographies of Helmarus (in 1862) and of Voltaire (in 1872). Such a career refutes itself, notwithstanding the great acuteness of the criticism of this author; for the only thing common to its successive philosophic schemes is the unbounded confidence with which each is upheld.

Similar is the failure of Ernest Renan, whose Vie de Jésus (1863) reveals less of a philosophic and theological basis; the chief thing of this kind being an immoral deism, which builds the universe upon the mixture of good and evil, and makes the spurious miracles of Jesus necessary to his success. Here there are less of the critical discourses of Strauss, and more of pictorial efforts to give the career of Jesus a lifelike reality, which, however, break down through the moral incongruities blended in the character, and the deviation of the history from its professed sources. Renan, in conformity with the tendency of recent criticism, even that of the Tübingen school, has in his work on the origin of Christianity, of which the life of Jesus is the first part, carried up the date of the gospels, much higher than Strauss, believing as he does that time was not needed for the transformation of history; and, though this must be denied, the admission as to these dates and facts of authorship is valuable on the side of Christian faith.

These works probably exhaust the struggles of Continental unbelief to deal with the Christian problem; the schemes of Schenkel in his Charakterbild (1869), and of Keim in his Jesus von Nazaret (1875), belonging to the Hegelian frame rather than that of the bishop. INFIDELITY, 1087 INFULA.

INFRALAPSARIANISM (from infra, "after," and lapsus, "a fall") is the doctrine, that God for his own glory determined (1) to create the world, (2) to permit the fall of man, (3) to elect from the mass of fallen men an innumerable multitude as "vessels of mercy," (4) to send his Son for their redemption, (5) to leave the residue of mankind to suffer the just punishment of their guilt.

This is the common doctrine of Augustinians, and is taught in the Calvinistic symbolical books. It is to be distinguished from supralapsarianism, the theory of some Calvinists, and is the same as sublapsarianism: which articles see.

INFULA means, in classical Latin, the band of red and white stripes which the priest and the victim wore around the brow at a pagan sacrifice: hence it was quite early introduced into Christian usage, and applied to the priest's head-dress, afterwards to that of the bishop.
In Gathering, Feast of. See Tabernacles, Feast of.

Ingham, Benjamin ("the Yorkshire Evangelist"), b. at Ossett, in Yorkshire, Eng., June 11, 1712; d. at Aberford in 1772. He was educated at Queen's College, Oxford, where he was one of the "Holy Club." On June 1, 1735, he was ordained by Bishop Potter, and soon after went on a sort of ecclesiastical itinerary of great usefulness among the villages about London, and then settled down as curate in Matching, Essex; but scarcely three months elapsed (Oct. 14) before he was induced to accompany John Wesley and others on his expedition to Georgia. He landed there Feb. 5, 1736; re-embarked for England, Feb. 26, 1737, in order to obtain help for the colonists, having accomplished almost nothing, except the composition, in Dr. Byrom's shorthand, of a list of half the words in an Indian language. On his outward voyage he had been in contact with Moravian bishops, and thus his life was affected. He and Wesley joined their London Society in Fetter Lane; and in 1738 he accompanied Wesley on his journey of inspection to Herrnhut, and was freely admitted to communion. On his return he preached in Yorkshire with singular effect; and, when prohibited (June 6, 1739) from the pulpit of the Established Church, he imitated John Wesley, and preached in the fields, barns, anywhere he could, and so successfully, that in 1740 he could say that fifty societies had been formed, and that he had two thousand hearers. In 1740 Wesley was expelled from the Fetter Lane Moravian Society; but Ingham remained in it, and thus virtually seceded from the Church of England, and became the head of the Yorkshire Moravians. On Nov. 12, 1741, he married in London, Lady Margaret Hastings, sister of the Earl of Huntingdon. On July 30, 1742, he formally transferred his Yorkshire and Lancashire societies to the Moravians, and immediately began forming others; for his special work was that of an evangelist at large. In 1744 he gave up open air preaching. In 1753, owing to the state of the Moravians in England, he withdrew from them, and established a sect of his own. Members were required by laying on hands. They had elders, deacons, and the love-feast and the Lord's Supper monthly. The chief governing power was in the hands of the general overseer, who was chosen and appointed by the trustees, with the consent of the societies. In 1755 Ingham was admitted to Wesley's conference at Leeds, although there is no clear evidence that he wished to unite his societies with Wesley's. After Ingham had been made general overseer, or, as Lady Huntingdon used to call him, "bishop," of his own sect, he ordained two of his fellow-laborers. In 1759 Ingham became in theology a Sandemanian (see art.) by reading Sandeman's Letters on Theron and Aspaso (Edinburgh, 1757). — a reply to the work of that name by James Hervey (London, 1757, 3 vols.). — and also Glascow's The Testimony of the King of Martyrs concerning His Kingdom (Perth, 1727). He sent two of his assistants to Scotland to see the leaders, and the result of their mission was the conversion to the Sandemanian tenets. A split in the Ingham sect followed. Out of the eighty societies so energetically gathered and ruled, only thirteen remained faithful to him. Many of them became Wesleyans, or dissenters; others joined the Daleites, or Scotch Independents,—a small sect established in Glasgow by David Dale, a wealthy cotton manufacturer, whose views, in general, were Sandemanian, only they were not so strict upon the question of intercourse with other denominations, and laid more stress upon practical holiness. The Inghamites never recovered the ground they lost. — Sorrow over the defection probably hastened Ingham's death. The only publication of his known to Tyerman is A Discourse on the Faith and Hope of the Gospel, Leeds, 1783, which contains his doctrinal views. His sect still survives, but in 1873 numbered only six societies. See Tyerman: The Oxford Methodists, New York, 1873, pp. 57-154.

Inglis, David, D.D., LL.D., b. at Greenlaw, Berwickshire, Scotland, June 8, 1824; d. in Brooklyn, N.Y., Dec. 15, 1877. He was graduated from the university of Edinburgh 1841; entered the Presbyterian ministry; emigrated to America 1846, and was pastor of several churches in the United States; called to Montreal 1852, and thence to Hamilton, Ont., 1855. From 1871 to 1872 he was professor of systematic theology in Knox College, Toronto. In the latter year he became pastor of the Reformed (Dutch) Church on the Heights, Brooklyn, N.Y. Dr. Inglis was of commanding presence, and a remarkably fine preacher, riveting the attention, notwithstanding the monotony of his delivery, and his incessant pacing back and forth in the pulpit.

Ingulfus, or Ingulf, abbot of Crowland, or Croyland; b. in London, 1080 (?) ; d. at Crowland, Lincolnshire, Eng., Dec. 16, 1109. In 1051 he became secretary to William of Normandy; in 1064 he went on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and on his return entered the monastery of Fontenelle in Normandy; but in 1076 he was made abbot of Crowland by his former patron, who had meanwhile become king of England, and through whom he secured many privileges for the abbey, besides the enlargement and adornment of the building itself. His name has long been famous for his supposed authorship of the Historia monasterii coriandeniensis, from the reign of Penda (d. 655) to 1091. A continuation of the History to 1117 was issued by Peter of Blois, archdeacon of Bath, who died 1220; and by three other continuations it was brought down to 1486. Fulman printed the work, as continued by Peter of Blois, in the first volume of Rerum anglicarum scriptores veteres, Oxford, 1884. But the History is now pronounced by competent judges, especially since Sir Francis Palgrave attacked it in the Quarterly Review, September, 1826, to be so largely interpolated, that it is without much historical authority. The Charters in it are plainly forgeries of a later date than Ingulf. The continuations have more value. The original work was probably of monkish origin, and dates from the thirteenth or fourteenth century. A translation of it by H. T. Riley forms a volume of Bohm's Antiquarian Library. See Hardy's Rerum Britannicarum medii aevi scriptores, vol. ii. (1863).

Inheritance among the Hebrews. Jehovah was acknowledged to be the owner of the land of Israel; and therefore, although it was formally divided among the twelve tribes, it was understood that the right to dispose finally
of the property was vested in him (Lev. xxv. 28). Accordingly, there could be no irrevocable parting with the birthright. The Year of Jubilee restored all property to its original owner or his heirs (Lev. xxv. 10). This fact explains Nabal's refusal to part with his vineyard, even to the king (1 Kings xxi. 8 sq.). Along with real estate, other things, such as slaves, came, at the death of the father, to his sons by his wife or wives. The sons by concubines received only presents (Gen. xv. 5 sq.), while the sons of harlots got nothing (Judg. xi. 2). The first-born son received a double portion of the entire inheritance, even in cases where a son of a favorite wife had the father's preference (Deut. xxi. 15–17). The cases of Esau and Reuben show that this right of primogeniture might be forfeited (Gen. xxv. 4 sq., xxviii. 17, xxix. 3). Daughters inherited only when there were no sons; and in these cases they must marry in their own tribe, lest the patrimony be alienated (Num. xxvi. 1–11, xxxvi.). In cases where there were no children, the brother, the paternal uncle, or if nearest kinsmen were not available (Num. xxvii. 9 sq.), sometimes a faithful slave inherited his master's property in cases where he had married the daughter (1 Chron. ii. 34, 35), or had been adopted (Gen. xv. 2, 3), or was guardian of an imbecile son (Prov. xvii. 2), or even in case of misconduct of the heir (2 Sam. xvi. 4). The Mosaic law so exactly defined the deposition of estates, that wills, in our sense of the term, were plainly superfluous; and so the word does not occur in the Hebrew Bible. The phrase "to set one's house in order" (in 2 Sam. xvii. 23 and Isa. xxxviii. 1) refers to household affairs merely. But wills necessarily became common among the Jews of the Dispersion, and they are referred to in the New Testament (Gal. iii. 16; Heb. ix. 17). The Hebrew word for them was "מִשְׁטָה", a transliteration of στήτησα, "to command." Occasionally there was a partial ante mortem distribution of property (cf. Luke xiv. 12); and sometimes, at least, as might be expected, property occasioned disputes (cf. Luke xii. 13 sq.)

INNER MISSION. The, an agency for promoting the spiritual and bodily welfare of the destitute and spiritually indifferent in Germany. Its ultimate object is to evangelize the classes that have fallen away from Christian truth and faith. The movement developed out of the conviction at Kaiserswerth that a movement was necessary, within the limits of Germany, as well as among the heathen, to stem the tide of irreligion, and to build up the kingdom of God. It was this conviction which led him to refuse the appeal of some friends to turn the Rauhe Haus at Hamburg [which he had founded in 1833] into an institution for training missionaries for the heathen. There was a sufficiently large field at home, and the two agencies were of sufficient importance to be kept separate. The term "Inner Mission" became the universal designation for this peculiar domestic work after Wichern's stirring appeal to the Protestant Church at the Kirchentag [a voluntary ecclesiastical synod: see art., held in Wittenberg, 1848.

The Inner Mission directs itself to those classes which have become indifferent to Christ, or, out of ignorance, have remained far from him. The term and work of the Inner Mission are more comprehensive than Home Missions, and include, not only efforts to spread the gospel by preaching, but also various other agencies for the spiritual, as well as physical, welfare of the destitute. It employs as its means the preaching of the gospel and efforts to relieve the victims of disease, and those who have been led astray. The Inner Mission is not a combination of a variety of associations and institutions devoted to different forms of benevolent Christian work. It uses such agencies, but is itself a force behind them, which also works through the instrumentality of individuals. Nor is it a mere philanthropic agency, but a distinctly evangelistic agency, whose ultimate aim is to win men to the gospel.

Since the organization of the movement at the Wittenberg Kirchentag, in 1848, the necessity for its existence has been made more apparent by the socialism, nihilism, humanitarian culture, and other evils, of the land. At that conference was formed the Central Committee of the Inner Mission of the German-Protestant Church. Its design was not to control the work, but to give suggestions and impuluses for the organization of efforts in different parts of the land. It originated a conference which has had twenty-two meetings, the last being held at Bremen, in September, 1881. The movement passed through a period of much opposition, but gradually won the sympathies of a large constituency from all schools of Christian thought and activity. Since 1848 the sphere of effort has become more comprehensive, and now includes schools for children and cripples, houses of refuge, the care of the sick and poor, the conduct of Sunday schools, the organization of young men's Christian Associations, the training of servants, the various forms of city missionary activity, the promotion of Sabbath observance, and other forms of Christian work. There are central committees in different parts of the land, and under their influence a body of specially trained evangelists, colportors, and other officers, has been educated. To these specific agencies of the Inner Mission must be added the Institution of Deaconesses [which was founded by Theodore Fliedner, in Kaiserswerth, 1836], which now numbers nearly four thousand sisters. The work of the Inner Mission is not dependent upon State control. It is not an organization, but an impulse or movement, which, working itself out in various parts of the land, seeks to advance the cause of true religion. The various institutions representing
the idea are supported by voluntary contributions. There is no central power upon which they depend.

LIT. — WICHERN: D. innere Mission d. deutsch. evang. Kirche, e. Denkschrift an d. deutsche Nation, second edition, Hamburg, 1849; the addresses of WICHERN and others, in the volume of the Proceedings of the Wittenberg Conference, Berlin, 1849; Brantzel: D. innere Mission, Leipzig, 1850; WICHERN: D. innere Mission, etc., Berlin, 1857; ZEESCHWITZ: Innere Mission, etc., Frankfurt, 1864; Beck: D. innere Mission; Augsburg, 1874. The periodical Fliegende Blätter, founded by WICHERN in 1844, is published at Hamburg, and is devoted to the objects of the Inner Mission. The Reports of the Proceedings (22 vols.) of all the church conferences have been published, and contain a vast amount of information on the subject. [For an extensive list of literature, covering four pages, see the German article.] F. OLENDENBURG.

INNOCENT I., Pope A.D. 402-417. According to Jerome, he was the son of his predecessor, Anastasius I., on whose death he was elected to the papal chair (in 402). A fundamental principle it was with him never to neglect an opportunity for extending the authority of the Roman see. On sending to Victorius, Bishop of Rouen, rules of discipline for use throughout Gaul, he inserts the injunction, "Si majoris causa in medium fuerint devolvit, ad sedem apostolicam, sicut synodus statuit, et beata consuetudo exigit; post judiciuin episcopalis referantur." If the reference here is to the edict of the Council of Sardica (344) on the subject, he certainly goes far beyond the somewhat general concessions here made; since he insists that all bishops in all weightier matters should report to Rome. Exuperius, Bishop of Toulouse, he highly compliments (406) for referring his inquiries to the Roman chair, without first attempting to decide them for himself. The Macedonian bishops he severely rebukes (414) for daring to consult him the second time on a point on which he had already given a decision. To Alexander of Antioch he explains (415) that the prerogatives yielded to his see were not on account of the greatness of Antioch, but simply because city had been, though for a brief while, the first seat of Peter; while at Rome, on the contrary, Peter had dwelt until his death. Yearly his claims for power grew more and more exorbitant. In 416 he writes to Bishop Decentius, "You do not know what has been handed down to the Roman Church by Peter, the prince of the apostles, must be held fast by all, especially since all the churches throughout Gaul, Spain, Italy, and Africa, owe their existence to priests ordained by Peter and his successors?"

A particularly favorable occasion presented itself for asserting the plenitude of authority of Rome, when in 417 he confirmed by letter the resolutions against the Pelagian heresy, adopted and sent to him the course which Chrysostom's case had taken, and seeking to enlist him on his own side, though it was only to be coolly told that the Pope would continue to recognize Chrysostom as bishop until convicted by a regular tribunal. Failing, however, in his effort to have Pelagius, who had been before him in a council composed of Eastern and Western bishops, the Pope renounced fellowship with Theophilus and his associates. To the afflicted Chrysostom in his exile, the conduct of the Pope was full of consolation and support, as he gratefully testifies.

Trying days befell Innocent when Alaric besieged Rome. Pending the negotiations with this invader, he went, by order of the senate, to Honorius, at Ravenna, to induce him to accept the proposals of the Goth. By this journey he was spared the sight of the cruelties inflicted on Rome. In 410 Alaric sacked the city, the periodical Fliegende Blätter, founded by Wichern in 1844, is published at Hamburg, and is devoted to the objects of the Inner Mission. The Reports of the Proceedings (22 vols.) of all the church conferences have been published, and contain a vast amount of information on the subject. [For an extensive list of literature, covering four pages, see the German article.] F. OLENDENBURG.

INNOCENT II., Pope A.D. 402-417. According to Jerome, he was the son of his predecessor, Anastasius I., on whose death he was elected to the papal chair (in 402). A fundamental principle it was with him never to neglect an opportunity for extending the authority of the Roman see. On sending to Victorius, Bishop of Rouen, rules of discipline for use throughout Gaul, he inserts the injunction, "Si majoris causa in medium fuerint devolvit, ad sedem apostolicam, sicut synodus statuit, et beata consuetudo exigit; post judiciuin episcopalis referantur." If the reference here is to the edict of the Council of Sardica (344) on the subject, he certainly goes far beyond the somewhat general concessions here made; since he insists that all bishops in all weightier matters should report to Rome. Exuperius, Bishop of Toulouse, he highly compliments (406) for referring his inquiries to the Roman chair, without first attempting to decide them for himself. The Macedonian bishops he severely rebukes (414) for daring to consult him the second time on a point on which he had already given a decision. To Alexander of Antioch he explains (415) that the prerogatives yielded to his see were not on account of the greatness of Antioch, but simply because city had been, though for a brief while, the first seat of Peter; while at Rome, on the contrary, Peter had dwelt until his death. Yearly his claims for power grew more and more exorbitant. In 416 he writes to Bishop Decentius, "You do not know what has been handed down to the Roman Church by Peter, the prince of the apostles, must be held fast by all, especially since all the churches throughout Gaul, Spain, Italy, and Africa, owe their existence to priests ordained by Peter and his successors?"

A particularly favorable occasion presented itself for asserting the plenitude of authority of Rome, when in 417 he confirmed by letter the resolutions against the Pelagian heresy, adopted and sent to him the course which Chrysostom's case had taken, and seeking to enlist him on his own side, though it was only to be coolly told that the Pope would continue to recognize Chrysostom as bishop until convicted by a regular tribunal. Failing, however, in his effort to have Pelagius, who had been before him in a council composed of Eastern and Western bishops, the Pope renounced fellowship with Theophilus and his associates. To the afflicted Chrysostom in his exile, the conduct of the Pope was full of consolation and support, as he gratefully testifies.

Innocent II. Gregorio de' Papi, or Pappareschi, Pope 1130-3. Having taken orders from Guibert of Ravenna, and afterwards filled important positions under Popes Paschal II., Gelasius II., and Calixtus II., we find him in 1128, in company with his after-opponent, Cardinal Peter Pierleoni, as papal legate in France.

While Pope Honorius lay dying, Gregory's practical tact, his friendly relation to the em- perial court, and his piety of life, attracted to him the favorable notice of those of the cardinals who were under the lead of the chancellor, Haimerlinus; and these, at most fifteen in number, ere yet the Pope had been interred, and without information of his decease having been sent to the absent cardinals, on the 10th of July (in the next ecclesiastical year, March 11, 1130). But his dread of the Roman nobles, who were mostly hostile to him, forced him to take refuge in a cloister occupied in common by the troops of the Cenci and Frangipani,
his chief friends in the city. Meanwhile Peter Pierleoni was chosen as his rival in an orderly election by a majority of the cardinals who were entitled to vote, and mounted the papal throne under the name of Anacletus II. (see art.). Impelled now by fear, Innocent II. fled to Pisa, and thence to Genoa, where Bernard had prepared for his reception by influencing the French court and clergy in his favor. Also, at the synod of Etampes, that same day, he annulled the appointment of Anacletus II. and the formal recognition of Innocent II. Then followed a long conflict between the partisans on both sides. In October, 1130, a synod held at Wurzburg declared for Innocent; and a stately embassy was sent to inform him of his recognition by the German sovereign, Lothair, and the German bishops. In January, 1131, Henry of England, at a personal interview, presented him with a thousand marks of silver. Encouraged by this support, Innocent demanded of Lothair that he march to Rome in force, expel his rival, and put him in his seat. In return, Lothair asked the surrender of those privileges which had been extorted by the Concordat of Worms, and was only dissuaded from insisting on this, by the eloquent appeal of Bernard. In August, 1133, Lothair marched to Italy; and, after some futile attempts at negotiation by Anacletus, he compelled the latter to shut himself in St. Peter's Church, and had himself crowned emperor in June, at the Lateran, by his chosen pope. As a requital for such success, Lothair once more pressed on the Pope his former request, but was again dissuaded from it, this time by Norbert; and he was obliged to content himself with some small concessions. During the festivities of the coronation, the Pope invested Lothair the emperor with the goods of Mathilda of Tuscany, on condition of an annuity of a hundred marks of silver. Encouraged by this support, Innocent demanded of Lothair that he march to Rome in force, expel his rival, and put him in his seat. In return, Lothair asked the surrender of those privileges which had been extorted by the Concordat of Worms, and was only dissuaded from insisting on this, by the eloquent appeal of Bernard. In August, 1133, Lothair marched to Italy; and, after some futile attempts at negotiation by Anacletus, he compelled the latter to shut himself in St. Peter's Church, and had himself crowned emperor in June, at the Lateran, by his chosen pope. As a requital for such success, Lothair once more pressed on the Pope his former request, but was again dissuaded from it, this time by Norbert; and he was obliged to content himself with some small concessions. During the festivities of the coronation, the Pope invested Lothair the emperor with the goods of Mathilda of Tuscany, on condition of an annuity of a hundred marks of silver. From this act was afterwards deduced the right of regarding the emperor as the vassal of the Roman see. On leaving Rome, Lothair committed the care of the care of the city to his brother, Lotario Conti, Pope's nephew, he might act a distinguished part in the ecclesiastical stairs. Appointed a sub-deacon by Gregory VIII., he in 1190 exchanged this position for that of cardinal-deacon at the wish of his uncle, Clement III., in order, that, as the Pope's nephew, he might act a distinguished part among the cardinals, rapidly mounted the ecclesiastical stairs. Appointed a sub-deacon by Gregory VIII., he in 1190 exchanged this position for that of cardinal-deacon at the wish of his uncle, Clement III., in order, that, as the Pope's nephew, he might act a distinguished part among the cardinals, while as yet not thirty years old. Owing, probably, to family jealousies, he was, under Celestine III., seldom called to the business of the curia. The leisure thus afforded he employed in composing various treatises,—one in three books (De contemptu mundi, De ignominia humanae conditionis), another in six books (Mysterium evangeliæ legis ac sacramentorum eucharistiae), another, on ecclesiastical law (De quadrupartiita specie nuptiarum). The first two only are extant. At the death of Celestine III. (Jan. 8, 1198) Lothair was elected pope, in the thirty-seventh year of his life; then, rapidly passing to the priestly and episcopal orders, he was crowned...
Feb. 22. Before entering on the world-wide problems of his position, it devolved on him to restore the papal seat to Rome, secure the respect of the Italians, induce the city prefect to recognize his superiority, and secure the resignation of the senator chosen by the people, and hitherto independent of papal authority. He then stepped forth as the deliverer of Italy from the dregs of the German princes appointed by Henry VI. He plucked Spoleto, subjected Perugia, took a commanding position in Tuscany, placed his rectors in patrimony, and soon became the acknowledged defender of national independence. Sicily, too, contributed to his good fortune. Here ruled Constance, the widow of Henry VI., as guardian of her minor son Frederic. Pressed by contending factions, she renounced the privileges of the Norman rule in relation to the Church, and took the oath of allegiance to Innocent as its feudatory. Dying in 1198, she by will named Innocent regent of the kingdom, and protector of her son. At once the Pope entered with zeal upon his new duties, subjecting the German princes to his young ward, and taking care of his education.

In Germany affairs were most favorable for the extension of the papal power there. Two claimants were contending for the imperial crown, — Philip of Swabia, and Otto IV. The latter at once sought the favor of Innocent by renouncing the rights of the empire in Italy, and surrendering the exarchate of Ravenna, the Pentapolis, and the kingdom of Spoleto. Philip's followers, on the contrary, showed a strong suspicion of the Pope. While promising him due respect as the head of the Church, they at the same time begged him not to interfere with the rights of the empire. Though naturally inclined to prefer the Guelp to the Hohenstaufen, yet, in a letter of reply to the German princes, the Pope assumed the appearance of an impartial umpire, desirous of preserving the independence of the electoral college, and fearful only, lest, by the choice of Philip, Germany become the hereditary possession of a ruling house. His hope was, that both claimants would submit their pretensions to a tribunal composed of German princes, and that Otto would be elected. In this he was disappointed. His next step was to issue a memorial on the subject, setting forth the superior claims of Otto as descended from a family long devoted to the Roman see, and a friend to the Church. On this ground Guido of Preneste was instructed to go to Germany as legate, and operate. In March, Innocent, by letter, recognized Otto as emperor, and in July secured the excommunication of all members of the opposing faction at an assembly of Otto's partisans. But this was done only after a renewed pledge given by the Guelph, dated Neuss, June 8, 1201, to concede to the Roman chair all the territories belonging to it; not that house " which it now holds from and which it may yet hold, and to assist it in obtaining those which it does not now occupy."

The significance of this document is evident, furnishing as it did a foundation for the wider extension of the Church state. In the fortune of arms Otto was at first successful; and Philip was induced to try negotiations with the Pope, but on terms which could not be granted. In 1204-05, however, affairs took a decided turn. Several of the strongest partisans of Otto deserted to Philip. The king of France, too, as Philip's ally, vanquished King John of England, Otto's confidant, in battle. Thus put in the ascendant, Philip directed a letter to Innocent, offering to submit the matters in dispute to a tribunal composed of cardinals, and princes of the empire. The Pope was forced to take account of the changed condition of affairs. Fearing the accession of Philip, and the latter remained unmoved, Innocent urged the victorious Hohenstaufen to accede to a tribunal to be constituted by himself at Rome, assuring him at the same time of a decision in his favor. To this both rivals at last yielded; and the consummation of Innocent triumphed at last in having the contest referred to Rome. Whether the tribunal was ever held, is uncertain.

One thing, however, is known: in spite of all his political shrewdness, the Pope was prevailed upon to pledge the restoration to the empire of all possessions unjustly obtained in Central Italy, provided Philip should be given a marriage to his nephew, and the latter as Philip's son-in-law, should be made Duke of Tuscany. Even the great Innocent could not withstand the temptation to nepotism. Just at this juncture, Philip was assassinated by Otto of Wittenbach (June 21, 1208), and Otto became the undisputed sovereign of Germany. Innocent again dexterously shifted his tactics. He held up before Otto the imperial crown, and wrote him, "We demand of thee, dearest son, the thing which thou canst not but grant, because it accords with thy view, and serves for thy soul's salvation." Otto replied, outdoing all his former pledges. He acknowledged the bounds of the States of the Church as drawn by Innocent, promised help in rooting out heresy, renounced interference in church elections, and, in short, surrendered every thing which had been secured to the empire by the Concordat of Worms. At such a price did Otto purchase his coronation as emperor. In the summer of 1209 he began his march over the Alps with a mighty host, and met the Pope at Viterbo. The interview was one which hardly sustained the Pope's first greeting, "This is my beloved son, in whom my soul is well pleased." Yet he deemed it not prudish to turn to Philip. His next step was to take issue a memorial on the subject, setting forth the terms which conceded to the pope his protector and benefactor, the Pope. On July 12, 1213, the emperor elect, crowned at Main. On July 12, 1213, the emperor elect guaranteed to his protector and benefactor, the Pope, the whole realms, rights, and possessions which Otto had formerly pledged. On July 27, 1214, the great battle of Bouvines was fought, which ended in the utter defeat of Otto, and decided the conflict in Frederic's favor; and in an imposing council held
at Rome in 1215, he was duly proclaimed emperor elect, with his rival claims anathematized. Death spared the Pope the discovery of the enormous blunder, which, from an ecclesiastical point of view, he had committed in thus exalting Frederick II. to the throne.

A worthier triumph was achieved by Innocent, over Philip (II.) Augustus of France, in forcing him to consent to his marriage relations. Under the pretext of a too close connection in blood, but really on the ground of a conceived aversion, this prince had obtained from his bishops a divorce from his wife Ingeburga, and had married Agnes, daughter of Duke Berthold III. Against such proceedings Celestine III. had already entered his protest, and now Innocent took up the cause of the rejected queen. His remonstrance being unheeded, he put the whole of France under interdict, stirred up against the king a large portion of the clergy, the nobles, and the common people, and at last, on Sept. 7, 1200, he compelled the pope to pledge the restoration of Ingeburga to her position as queen and wife. It was, however, to little purpose. The separation which the king could not effect by law, he sought to accomplish by subjecting his wife to constant vexations and humiliations, which might eventually compel her to leave him of her own accord. In all these trials the Pope remained her friend; and though he relaxed somewhat in the energy of his measures for her relief, when the aid of the king was needed in some of his projects, yet he persevered in refusing his consent to the divorce, and had the satisfaction of knowing at last that the queen, who for seventeen years had been watched and harassed as a prisoner, was received back into full honor by her penitent husband. With like success the Pope interfered in the domestic affairs of Alphonso IX. of Leon, whose wife he constrained to depart from him by the force of an interdict, because of a too close consanguinity; and also in those of Peter of Aragon, whose contemplated espousal of Bianca of Aragon he prevented for the same reason; and then, when, after Peter's marriage with Maria of Montpellier, the royal libertine wished to put her away and repudiate her by force of that act, Innocent, by ecclesiastical weapons alone, soon brought the offender to terms, and humbled him even to the surrender of his kingdom, which he accepted back as a papal feoff. King Sancho of Portugal, also, he compelled to pay the tribute promised to the papal see by his father, though much against his will; and Ladislaus of Poland, when guilty of robbing the church and bishops of goods and rights, he soon subjected to his requirements. The extent to which Innocent asserted to himself the sole right of putting princes under ban, and of releasing them from it, may be seen in his refusal, in 1213, to release Henry of Burgundy, who had been put on the kingdom by the king of France, pending his trial for rebellion. When this king, upon atonement made for his father's wrongs, was released from the ban which had been put on the kingdom by the king of France, pending his trial for rebellion, the Pope wrote to Eric that he had imitated him a pe-fashion, and reminded him that such release was valid only when granted by the vicar of St. Peter. It was in 1215, at the instigation of Stephen Langton, who happened to be at Rome, and secured the whole of France under interdict, stirred the Pope, refusing to sanction his choice, made a countermove by convening some members of the convention, who happened to be at Rome, and securing, through them, election of Stephen Langton, a cardinal priest, to the contested position. This step enraged the king. When threatened with an interdict, he swore, "by God's teeth," that he would hunt every ecclesiastic who dared to proclaim it, out of the land. The interdict fell, and John sought to make good his oath. A ban followed; and, in spite of all John's efforts to hinder its publication, it became known. The nobles, who hated his tyranny, rose against him; and fierce the conflict grew, until at last Innocent declared the throne vacant, and instigated Philip Augustus of France to take possession of it, promising to all who engaged in the attempt the title and privilege of crusaders. This extreme measure frightened the king into abject submission; and on May 13, 1213, he concluded a convention with ten papal plenipotentiaries at Dover, pledging the acknowledgment of Stephen Langton as archbishop, and the restoration to the church of all its property which had been seized, and also of all exiles to their homes. Nor was this humiliation sufficient. To secure himself against the threatened invasion of Philip, although under the pretext of atoning for his sins, on May 18 John surrendered his realms "to God and the Pope," and received them back as a papal feudatory, bound to an annual payment of seven hundred marks for England, and three hundred for Ireland. Then it was, when prostrate in the dust at the feet of the archbishop as a suppliant for mercy, that he was released from the ban. The interdict was not lifted until July 2, 1214, on the fulfilment of the conditions pledged. But, though now reconciled with the Pope, the quarrel with the barons went on, until they extorted from the king the famous Magna Charta, and thus laid the foundation of the English political constitution. No sooner did Innocent learn of these transactions than he pronounced the terms of the charter null and void. It touched too closely upon the royal prerogatives, and indirectly upon the feudal sovereignty of the Pope. But neither declaration nor excommunication had any effect on the nation. One only who took part in the uprising of the barons fell a sacrifice under the power of the Pope: this was Langton. By reason of his refusal to put the insurgents under the ban, he was, while attending a council at Rome in 1215, suspended from his archbishopric. But nothing so damaged the papal cause in England as this opposition of Innocent to the Magna Charta. Here it was where the Pope had at last fully realized his ideal of the true relations between Church and State, and here it was where the papacy began to encounter its most effective opposition.

What Innocent's ideal was may be learned from what he wrote to King John: "Jesus Christ wills
that the kingdom should be priestly, and the priesthood kingly. Over all, he has set me as his vicar upon earth, so that, as before Jesus 'every knee shall bow,' in like manner to his vicar all shall be obedient, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd. Raising this thought, thou, according to the Roman chair before princes and peoples, that whatsoever he did was wrought in and through the influence of Him whose vicar he was. Moreover, he applied to himself the word of Jesus: "All power is given unto me in heaven and earth." Peter's miraculous walk upon the sea was to him a sign of how the nations of the earth were to be subdued under the feet of himself and his successors. Like Melchizedek, the Pope, he conceived, united in one person the offices of king and high priest. And as, in the ark of the covenant, the rod was placed beside the tables of the law, so he considered, that, in the heart of the Pope, there resided together both the fearful power of destruction and the right to bestow life. The parallel already drawn by Gregory VII., comparing the Church and State to the sun and moon severally, Innocent expanded into an illustration for showing how the State was actually dependent on the Church for its true lustre and glory. A frequent declaration of his was it, that the priesthood alone (i.e., the Church) sprang from the divine appointment, while the State originated "from human extortions." Hence, in all cases where a heinous sin was in question, he claimed the right to test the decisions of the secular tribunals, and if necessary to quash them. Both the secular and the spiritual swords, he affirmed, belonged to the Pope; and, while he reserved to himself the latter, the former he gave over to the princes.

In discharging his duty as the vicar of Christ, Innocent now, as at the beginning of his pontificate, felt it obligatory on him to summon the kings and peoples of the earth to a holy war for the recovery of Palestine. In this movement he was largely aided by the rare eloquence of William, earl of Warenne, who, in the year 1204, was early turned aside from its undertaking by the doge Dandolo, who employed it for the recovery of Zara from the king of Hungary. In vain did Innocent use warning and threatening to divert them from this attempt. The doge's work was done. Hardly was this difficulty disposed of, when the crusading host engaged in another enterprise, equally foreign to their original purpose, and no less contrary to the will of the Pope. Influenced, by the persuasions of Philip of Germany, they lent their assistance to his brother-in-law, Alexius Angelus, in his project of regaining his ancestral inheritance from the usurper, Alexius III. Constantinople was captured. But by this event the relations between the Greeks and Latins became so disturbed, that, in a popular insurrection, Alexius was caught, imprisoned, and finally strangled. Thereupon the crusaders took possession of the city, and set up there a Latin empire. On May 12, 1204, Baldwin of Flanders was crowned emperor. This event, opening as it did to the Pope a prospect of uniting the Greek and Latin churches, reconciled him to the course pursued by the crusaders, and in a letter to them he expressed the joyful hope that henceforth the church should be but one fold and one shepherd. And now was vouchsafed to him that which his predecessors had sighed for in vain; viz., the nomination of a Catholic patriarch for Constantinople.

On Oct. 12, 1204, Innocent issued a bull for raising a crusading expedition into Livonia. The leader of the several enterprises which followed was Albert, Bishop of Lusignan, who succeeded in baptizing the Livonians in 1206, and also the neighboring Letti in 1208, and subjecting both to the chair of Peter. In reward for this, Albert was released from the control of his metropolitan at Bremen, and, as in a measure, independent. But, on his becoming involved in a conflict with the "Knighthood of Christ in Livonia," Innocent sought to adjust the difficulty by a compromise, the conflicting terms of which soon made it evident how impracticable it was for a church power to be centralized at Rome to manage wisely the conditions and relations of remote ecclesiastical provinces.

It is not so creditable to Innocent, that he first employed the crusades for the extermination of heresy. In 1207 he enjoined on the French king the duty of annihilating the heretics of Toulouse. The cruelties inflicted on the Albigenses, in consequence, are not to be charged so much on Innocent himself as on his system, which may be traced back to Augustine (see art. CATHARI). The orders of the Pope against heretics were approved at the twelfth general synod (1215), and incorporated in the canon law. They were, in substance, that all rulers should be exhorted to tolerate no heretics in their domains; if a ruler refused to clear his land of heretics at the demand of the Church, and should persist in his refusal, he should be deprived of his authority, and even excommunicated; if a ruler refused to join in the expeditions against heretics, like favors should be granted as were granted to crusaders. At the same council the severest enactments were issued against the Jews. Rulers were forbidden to trust them with public offices. In order to be known as Jews, they were to clothe themselves with a peculiar garb. During Holy Week they were not to appear on the streets, lest, in that season of sorrow, Christians should be scandalized by their decorated attire. At this council, also, condemnation was pronounced upon the doctrine of Amalrich of Bena (see art.); and on a treason against Peter Lombard by Joseph of Flore (see art.). Moreover, the formation of new monastic orders was discouraged; and alike on Dominic and on Francis, both of whom prayed to have their orders confirmed, was the command of the council imposed, that they should subject their societies to the regulations of the church. The last deliverance of the council was to summon Christendom to a new crusade to the Holy Land, in 1217. At this council, held near the close of Innocent's pontificate, the Pope showed himself as the unlimited ruler of the great ones of the world and of the church. Emperors, kings, and princes had sent to it their plenipotentiaries; and fifteen hundred
archbishops, bishops, and abbots took part in its transactions, or, rather, were present to listen to and record the decrees of Innocent. Deliberations, properly speaking, there were none. Consent followed at once on the reading of the Pope's decree. But, while the ecclesiastics thus exalted the Pope's authority, they virtually voted their own abdication. None of Innocent's predecessors had so cut down the privileges of bishops and metropolitans as he had done, and none had so largely assumed the right of patronage belonging to local church officers. He was the first to assert the Pope's right to grant benefices; and he issued a decree. But, while the ecclesiastics thus exalted the Pope's right to grant benefices, he was the first to assert the Pope's right to grant benefices. And he did this at the cost of the country clergy, and to the disparagement of the Romish clergy, and even to his own relatives and intimates. Even during his reign, his bulls and decretals were collected and published at three several times; and a fourth collection, comprising those of the last six years, was issued shortly after his death. But, though thus crowded with work, this Pope found leisure for literary labors. He has left us a collection of the seven penitential Psalms, evincing a tone of sincere piety. Moreover, he preached frequently, not only at Rome, but also upon his journeys; and those of his sermons which have come down to us bear testimony to his earnest piety and deep humility. Once and again did he utter a sigh for rest from occupations which wore out body and soul. And this rest he found in death (July 16, 1216) at Perugia, where he was buried in the cathedral. In the midst of a busy and stormy life Innocent found time for grand missionary enterprises to the East. He ceded to the Church proprietary right over Prussia, which he had claimed for self-sacrifice, he showed the devoted Christian. We can hardly call him covetous, since he devoted his whole income to the good of the Church. The only spot which cleaves almost to the entire Papacy is that he did once endow his relatives and trusted servants with ecclesiastical livings; but this is a spot which leaves almost to the entire Papacy.


**INNOCENT IV.** (Senibaldi de Fieschi), Pope 1243-54. Celestine IV. died suddenly, and was followed, June 25, 1243, after the interval of a year and a half, by Innocent IV., whose choice was secured through the influence of the emperor. The new pontiff was an eminent jurist belonging to one of the first families of Genoa; and it was hoped that his election would terminate the long strife which had been waged between the Church and the emperor, inasmuch as the new Pope, while cardinal, had been the constant friend of the latter. To this end a settlement was proposed, highly advantageous to the Pope, but which failed of success by reason of the mutual distrust entertained by the parties. The Pope, pending negotiations, fled suddenly to Lyons, whither he called a general council, for the ostensible purpose of correcting abuses in the Church, of carrying aid to the Eastern Christians, and of settling the difficulties between the Church and the empire. The emperor, on the other hand, issued, in his own interest, a letter to the princes of Christendom, unveiling the real purpose of the Pope, and promising to organize a crusade, provided Innocent would remove the ban that had been put on him, and would quiet the rebellion in Lombardy. But, at the third session of the papal council, Frederick II. was deposed and excommunicated, and the electoral princes called upon to choose a new emperor. Notwithstanding the mediation of Louis IX., and the orthodox confession made by the emperor before the Bishop of Palermo, the Pope remained obdurate, and the strife waxed bitter. Innocent fomented rebellion in Sicily, and had Henry Raspe, landgrave of Turinigia, proclaimed emperor of Germany. The princes of the empire, however, for the most part remained true to Frederick; and his rival soon fell, fighting against the imperial forces, led by Conrad, son of Frederick. His death left Frederick's influence in Germany paramount. The Pope could find no one willing to accept the gift of the crown, save Count William of Holland, whose supporters had to be bought with gold. Frederick died Dec. 15, 1247, transmitting his feud with the Pope to his son Conrad, whose hereditary crown of Sicily Innocent had bestowed upon the English prince Edmund. Sudden death, which so often had favored the popes, carried off Conrad while in the act of asserting his rights. His infant heir, the ten-year-old Conradin, was left under the guardianship of Manfred, natural son of Frederick, who made terms with the pontiff, on condition that the claims of his ward to the Sicilian crown should be respected. The Pope proving faithless, Manfred took the field, and succeeded in compelling the entire papal army to surrender. Inconsequent died five days later, at Naples, where he lies buried in the cathedral. In the midst of a busy and stormy life Innocent found time for grand missionary enterprises to the East. He ceded to Conrad, Grand Master of the German order, his proprietary right over Prussia, which he had
divided into four bishoprics. To him, also, is due the custom of decorating cardinals with the red hat. He is, moreover, the author of a work entitled *Apparatus in quinque libros decretalium*, highly prized as an authority on canon law, and also of *De Rosis de Papae VI. rubris* and *Peter de Vinea*, the chancellor of Frederick II. He died at Naples, Dec. 7, 1254.

**INNOCENT V.** (Pietro de Tarantasia), Pope 1276, was chosen to succeed Gregory X. Jan. 21, 1276. He had been Archbishop of Lyons, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, and grand confessor. His first aim was to reconcile the warring factions of the Guelph and Ghibelline, which had embroiled the Italian states; and he succeeded so far as to bring Lucca and Pisa into friendly relation, and give peace to Tuscany. Whilst preparing to send a numerous embassy to the Greek emperor, Michael Paleologus, in the interest of the union of the two churches east and west (to which the Greek ambassadors at Lyons had previously consented), Innocent died (June 22), after a brief pontificate of five months. He was a voluminous writer. Besides his postils and quodlibets, he composed a number of philosophic and other works, most noteworthy of which were commentaries on the Pauline Epistles and on the "Sentences" of Peter Lombard. A hundred propositions drawn from his writings, and condemned by learned contemporaries, were condemned by the Council of Lyons, 1274, and his name is found in the Index of Prohibited Books of the Index of 1586. On the death of Clement VI. the cardinals assembled, and, before making choice of his successor, proceeded to limit the prerogatives of the papal chair as follows: (1) The Pope shall appoint no new cardinals until the existing number shall have been reduced to sixteen. The whole number shall never exceed twenty, and none shall be appointed without the consent of at least two-thirds of the cardinals. (2) The Pope shall not imprison, depose, place under the ban, or suspend a cardinal, without the consent of all his peers. (3) The Pope shall neither alienate the lands of the Church, nor invest any one with the same, without the consent of two-thirds of the cardinals. (4) The revenues of the Church shall be equally divided; one half going to the support of the Pope, the other to the cardinals. (5) No relative of the Pope shall be appointed governor of any of the provinces of the Church. (6) The Pope shall not receive tithes of ecclesiastical livings, nor any subsidies, without consent of two-thirds of the cardinals. These propositions the cardinals were compelled to subscribe under oath, some doing so with the reservation "Si jure niterentur." Thereupon the votes were taken; and the choice fell upon Stephen Albert, Bishop of Ostia, Dec. 18, 1302. He took the title of Innocent VI., and his first act was to declare the propositions which he subscribed with the reservation above specified null and void. Deeply versed in canon law, and severe in morals, he at once set about correcting abuses. Unlawful grants were recalled; grievous taxes were abolished; the clergy who had flocked to Avignon on the occasion of his coronation, in the hope of prebend, were ordered to return within five days to their benefices, on the pain of excommunication; and by precept and example the luxurious living of the cardinals was rebuked. That the judges of the Rota might be the more impartial, they were assigned a competent support. Charles IV., who was crowned at Rome April 5, 1355, was compelled by the Pope to leave Germany the next day. Bolognese lords were wrested from Bernardo Visconti, the powerful and unscrupulous ruler of Milan. The new Pope, moreover, sought to mediate between Edward of England, and John of France, and to unite the Venetians and Genoese, then at war with each other, against the Turks. He also put Peter of Castile under the ban for poisoning his wife, and undertook to fortify Avignon against the hordes of mercenaries which were plundering the south of France; but, ere he could complete the latter work, the city was invested, and the withdrawal of the besiegers had to be purchased by a large sum of money and a plenary pardon. At the instance of Charles IV. the festival of the Sacred Lance was instituted, to be celebrated yearly, on the Friday following Easter, throughout Germany and Bohemia. The Mendicant Friars, whose reputation for sanctity had greatly suffered in the popular estimation, found a powerful champion in Innocent, who restored them to all former privileges. He died Sept. 12, 1362, leaving behind him the reputation of a just and upright man. Of his writings there have come up to us only a few letters and some bulls.

**INNOCENT VI.** (Etienne d'Albert), Pope 1352-62. On the death of Clement VI. the cardinals assembled, and, before making choice of his successor, proceeded to limit the prerogatives of the papal chair as follows: (1) The Pope shall appoint no new cardinals until the existing number shall have been reduced to sixteen. The whole number shall never exceed twenty, and none shall be appointed without the consent of at least two-thirds of the cardinals. (2) The Pope shall not imprison, depose, place under the ban, or suspend a cardinal, without the consent of all his peers. (3) The Pope shall neither alienate the lands of the Church, nor invest any one with the same, without the consent of two-thirds of the cardinals. (4) The revenues of the Church shall be equally divided; one half going to the support of the Pope, the other to the cardinals. (5) No relative of the Pope shall be appointed governor of any of the provinces of the Church. (6) The Pope shall not receive tithes of ecclesiastical livings, nor any subsidies, without consent of two-thirds of the cardinals. These propositions the cardinals were compelled to subscribe under oath, some doing so with the reservation "Si jure niterentur." Thereupon the votes were taken; and the choice fell upon Stephen Albert, Bishop of Ostia, Dec. 18, 1302. He took the title of Innocent VI., and his first act was to declare the propositions which he subscribed with the reservation above specified null and void. Deeply versed in canon law, and severe in morals, he at once set about correcting abuses. Unlawful grants were recalled; grievous taxes were abolished; the clergy who had flocked to Avignon on the occasion of his coronation, in the hope of prebend, were ordered to return within five days to their benefices, on the pain of excommunication; and by precept and example the luxurious living of the cardinals was rebuked. That the judges of the Rota might be the more impartial, they were assigned a competent support. Charles IV., who was crowned at Rome April 5, 1355, was compelled by the Pope to leave Germany the next day. Bolognese lords were wrested from Bernardo Visconti, the powerful and unscrupulous ruler of Milan. The new Pope, moreover, sought to mediate between Edward of England, and John of France, and to unite the Venetians and Genoese, then at war with each other, against the Turks. He also put Peter of Castile under the ban for poisoning his wife, and undertook to fortify Avignon against the hordes of mercenaries which were plundering the south of France; but, ere he could complete the latter work, the city was invested, and the withdrawal of the besiegers had to be purchased by a large sum of money and a plenary pardon. At the instance of Charles IV. the festival of the Sacred Lance was instituted, to be celebrated yearly, on the Friday following Easter, throughout Germany and Bohemia. The Mendicant Friars, whose reputation for sanctity had greatly suffered in the popular estimation, found a powerful champion in Innocent, who restored them to all former privileges. He died Sept. 12, 1362, leaving behind him the reputation of a just and upright man. Of his writings there have come up to us only a few letters and some bulls.

**INNOCENT VII.** (Cosimo de Migliorati), Pope 1404-06. On the death of Boniface IX., the cardinals bound themselves by oath to do their utmost to secure the healing of the great Western schism, mutually pledging their willingness to resign even the papal chair, in case such a step should be deemed necessary to the furtherance of an end so desirable. The new Pope (elected Oct. 17, 1404) was distinguished alike for the purity of his character and the extent of his learning, particularly in the provinces of civil and canon law. He had been previously appointed to several responsible positions, and employed in a number of delicate missions, by Urban VI.; nominated also chamberlain of the Church in 1400; he had been sixty-five years old when elected Pope. He assumed the title of Innocent VII. Shortly after his accession, a tumult broke out in Rome between the Guelphs and Ghibellines; a nephew of Innocent heading the former. In it a number of citizens were slain, and the Pope was compelled to flee the city. His exile, however, was brief. The people, as soon as they were convinced of his freedom from all complicity in the murderous act, restored him in triumph. Since the party opposed to the Pope was openly encouraged by Ladislaus, king of Naples, and Neapolitan troops were employed by it in attacking the city, and raids into the country, Innocent was compelled to put the king under the ban, and declare his kingdom forfeited. The king, however, fearing an attack from his rival, the Duke of Anjou, soon submitted to the conditions of the Pope. About this time, the Pope ordered the turn with Bosnia as far as Genoa, desiring safe conduct from Innocent to Rome, under the pretext of holding con-
INNOCENT VIII. (Giovanni Battista Gibo), Pope 1484–92; chosen Aug. 29, 1484. He sprang from a Genoese family of Greek origin. We find him first as a youth at the Neapolitan churches. From a Genoese family of Greek origin. We find him first as a youth at the Neapolitan...
is alleged, in the ruin of agriculture in Italy. Innocent died Jan. 5, 1655. His pontificate covers a period of deep degeneracy in the Church, marked by a conningling of things profane and sacred, and by the domination of parasites and mistresses, the Church all the while contending for her ancient prerogatives in all their fulness. See Rosstenscher: *Hist. Inn. X., Wittenberg,* 1674; and Ranke: *Hist. of the Popes.

**INNOCENT XI.** (Benedetto Odescalchi), Pope 1676—89. He was b. at Como, May 16, 1611; educated by the Jesuits, and studied law at Genoa, Naples, and Rome. After having distinguished himself for his integrity and ability in various high positions, he was created cardinal (1647) through the influence of Donna Olimpia, and subsequently nominated legate of Ferrara, and Bishop of Novara. He owed his elevation, Sept. 21, 1676, to the French party in the College of Cardinals. On his accession, he set about the furtherance of a stricter morality in Church and State. He re- buked by his example the prevailing extravagance, rigidly limiting his own expenses, and abolishing all cardinals' shirt services could be dispensed with; revived the stringent laws regulating the examination of candidates for consecration; enjoined upon the clergy the leading of holy lives, the catechising of the children, and the opening of schools for their instruction; forbade the use of dialectic sophistries and fables in the pulpit, bidding the priest proclaim only the crucified Christ; dismissed the eunuchs from the papal chapel; interdicted the luxuries habits of dress prevalent amongst the women, forbidding them the study of music; condemned the morality of the Jesuits in his bull March 2, 1679; and came into collision with France on account of the so-called "Privi- lege of Asylum" claimed by foreign ambassadors for criminals, not only within their palaces, but also in the precincts adjacent. This privilege Louis XIV. would not consent to have abrogated; and his ambassador De Lavardin, who entered Rome with a retinue of a thousand soldiers and servants, was accordingly put under the ban. Neither party would yield, and the "Regal Right" remained open until after the death of the Pope. It was finally settled in his favor. The so-called "Regal Right" was another apple of discord between the Pope and the French king. Louis had insisted upon appropriating the revenues of certain vacant churches and benefices, even in cases where they had not been planted by the crown. This attempt was resisted by the bishops; and the Pope sustained them, even to the extent of threatening the king with the extreme censure of the Church. As a countermove, the latter called a council of the French clergy (Nov. 8, 1681), who not only confirmed the disputed claims of the throne, but made a solemn delivercial consisting of four fundamental propositions (*Quattor proposi- tiones Cleri Gallicani*). A copy of these, by order of the Pope, was openly burnt at the hands of the public executioner, and confirmation refused to all such as were nominated to livings. In consequence, at his death, the bishops of no less than thirty dioceses were without papal consecration. Though the cruel persecution of the Jesuits, and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, by the French king, subsequently drew from the Pope the very highest commendation of the king, he never, to the day of his death, halted in his opposition to the so-called "Regal Right, or Freedom of Quarter." Innocent died Aug. 12, 1689. The French king and the Jesuits alike sought to blacken his memory after death; and his canoniza- tion, urged by Philip II. encountered opposition chiefly from these quarters. Without doubt he was an ecclesiastical prince of pure and noble virtues, and one of the most illustrious men that had ever filled the chair of St. Peter. He was compelled by the Inquisition, and whose style a bull, the writings of Molinos (Nov. 20, 1687), although he was very friendly to Molinos. The efforts of James II. to convert England to Catholicism were, by Innocent, not only considered rash, but as calculated to increase the power of the king and lead to an alliance with France, rather than to advance the Church. The fall of James was therefore not mourned; and his plea for the papal help was answered by a cool rejection, on the ground of the Pope's absorption in his struggle with France. See *Geiran: Le pape Innocent XI. et la révolution anglaise de 1688,* Paris, 1876 [also Bigelow: *Molinos the Quietist,* N. Y., 1882, which gives, pp. 113-127, a translation of Innocent's bull, and Molinos].

**INNOCENT XII.** (Antonio Pignatelli), Pope 1700—1705, was elected Feb. 12, 1701, after a five-months' conclave. Born March 13, 1615, he was in his seventy-seventh year when elected. He entered public life early. After holding many important offices, was made cardinal bishop of Faenza, and archbishop of Naples by Innocent XI., which he strove to imitate. He had no sooner taken his seat than he set his face sternly against nepotism. The poor were his beneficiaries; the Lateran, his hospital. He declared it unlawful for any pope in the future to invest his relatives with any of the offices or revenues of the Church. He sought to reform cloister discipline and the lives of the secular clergy; interdicted the lottery; brought to a close the controversy with the French king, on the condition of limiting the exercise of the "Regal Right" to benefices lying within the territory of Old France. The Pope was several times involved in controversy with Leopold I. of Germany in reference to questions of precedence; but, through mutual concessions, these, as they arose, were amicably settled. Friendly relations with Charles II. of Spain were interrupted by a question concerning the Inquisition in Naples. Pending its solution, both king and pope died; the latter Sept. 27, 1700. In the controversy between Bossuet and Fénelon, the Pope decided for the former, condemning some twenty-three propositions, which he affected to find in Fénelon's writings, as contrary to good morals and sound doctrine. He bequeathed a large sum of money to a hospital which he had founded, and ordered that the money accruing from the sale of his personal effects should be given to the poor. His reputation is that of a just, charitable, unselfish, and beneficent man.

**INNOCENT XIII.** (Michel Angelo Conti), Pope 1721-24. He was born May 13, 1665. Alexander VIII. had made him a member of his court family, and Clement XI., cardinal. He
INNOCENTS' DAY was celebrated May 8, 1721, after a stormy session of the conclave, during which the cardinals came to blows, and inquests were hurled. His accession was hailed as promising rest to the Church, and peace to Christendom. His nomination of his brother as cardinal aroused fears of nepotism, which, happily, proved groundless. Italy prospered under his reign. Like his predecessor, he espoused the cause of the Pretender to the British throne under the title of James III. Charles VI. of Germany invested the kingdom of Naples. He also wrested Castel Palo, on the Mediterranean, from its unwilling proprietor, and, under French influence, clothed a contemptible profligate with the office of cardinal. These two last acts are spots on a character otherwise fair. When Malta was invested by the Turks, after issuing a call to Christendom, he himself hastened to the rescue with men and money. He had serious thoughts of abolishing the order of the Jesuits on account of their opposition to the Chinese mission, and took under his protection the so-called "Constitution Unigenitus," which had been wrung from his predecessor. His death occurred March 7, 1724.

INNOCENTS' DAY, a church festival in honor of the children slain by Herod in Bethlehem (Matt. ii. 16), and who thus were in a sense the first Christian martyrs. It was very early celebrated; for it is mentioned by Irenaeus and Cyprian, at first, in connection with Epiphany. Later, in the Western Church, Innocents' Day came on Dec. 28; in the Eastern Church, on Dec. 29. It is not known when the festivals were given different days. Peter of Venera (Chrysologus), a bishop of the fifth century, left two sermons upon the Massacre of the Innocents, considered quite apart from the Epiphany, and the fact would seem to indicate that the separation was made in his day. At present, in the Roman, Anglican, and Episcopal churches, Innocents' Day is Dec. 28. The Roman priest celebrates the mass on this day in a blue gown. The Armeno-Gregorian calendar gives the number of infants slain by Herod at fourteen thousand: the true number was probably less than this.

INNS AMONG THE HEBREWS. In one sense of the term, inns did not exist in antiquity; but there were enclosures which afforded some protection, and in which there was a fountain. In later times there were built "khans," or "caravanserias," which are large square buildings containing rooms enclosing an open court (Jer. ix. 2). But no food for man or beast was provided, as the traveller was expected to carry it with him. In the parable of the Good Samaritan, mention is made (Luke x. 34) of another sort of caravanserai, which had a keeper, and where personal care, besides food, could be obtained. The "inn" to which Joseph and Mary went (Luke ii. 7) was probably a caravanserai.

INQUISITION (Inquisitio hereticarum pravitatis), or the "Holy Office" (Sanctum Officium), is the name of the spiritual court of the Roman-Catholic Church, the detective and penal arm of the Church. It was the abnormal outgrowth of the ancient ecclesiastical discipline which charged the bishops with the duty of searching out the heresies in their dioceses, and stemming the progress of error. [The Church fathers treated all departures from the creed of the Church with great severity, and the early councils forbade all relations of the members of the Church with heretics.] From the reign of Constantine the Great the laws against heretics became more and more rigorous. [In 316 Constantine issued an edict condemning the Donatists to the loss of their goods.] But the first Christian emperor to pronounce the sentence of death against them was Theodosius, who, in 382, condemned the Manicheans. Eminent Church fathers, however, like Chrysostom (Homil. 29, 40, in Math.) and Augustine (Ep. 83 ad Vicentium, etc.), pronounced against the death penalty; but Jerome (Ep. 37 ad Riparium) found a justification of it in Deut. xiii. 6 sqq., and Leo the Great openly advocated it (Ep. 15 ad Turribrum). The civil arm executed the penalty, but bishops and clergy were often lukewarm in searching out heretics. The see of Rome was not content with decrees of councils or the capitularies of Charlemagne commanding the bishops to check error, and gave full powers into the hands of legates, who, backed by the edicts of councils (Toulouse, 1119; Oxford, 1190; Tours, 1169; the Third Lateran, 1179; Verona, 1184), relentlessly pursued the Cathari and the Poor Men of Lyons in Southern France, and the Cathari in Northern Italy. Finally it was Innocent III. [1193-1216] who developed the organization for the detection and punishment of heretics which for several centuries conducted the Inquisition, in the technical sense of the term.

By the Fourth Lateran Council every bishop was instructed to visit his see in person, or to appoint visitors of irreproachable character to do it, and, where the exigencies of the case demanded it, to take an oath of the inhabitants to inform against heretics, and to reveal their places of meeting. The refusal to take the oath was regarded as an evidence of heresy.

The measures of Innocent III. were revised by the Council of Toulouse (1229). It passed forty-five articles, instructing the bishops to bind by an oath a priest in every parish, and two or more laymen, to search out and apprehend heretics and those who sheltered them. Heresy was to be punished with the loss of property, and the house in which a heretic was found was to be burned. Heretics who repented were to wear two crosses,—one on their back, and one on their chest. But if the repentance seemed to be a result of the fear of death, the guilty person was to be shut up in a convent. Every two years, males from fourteen years upwards, and females from twelve years upwards, were obligated to repeat an oath to inform against heretics. The neglect of the annual confession was a sufficient ground of suspicion, as also the possession of heretical books and of manuscripts. In spite of these measures and the rigorous execution of them, especially in Southern France, the desired result was not secured. The bishops were accused of apathy, and were themselves made subject to the Inquisition. The Inquisition was made a standing commission of inquisitors in Austria, Germany, Aragon, Lombardy, and
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Southern France. At the same period was organized the so-called "soldiery of Jesus Christ against heretics." Louis the Pious, in his famous edict of 1228 (ad cives Narbonnae) made it the special duty of the civil power to root out heresy, and to punish without delay those who were condemned. The suspicion of heresy was made a sufficient ground for apprehension; and, by a bull of Innocent IV. in 1252 (ad extirpanda), recant was to be had, if necessary, to torture, to extract a confession.

The notion of heresy was enlarged so as to comprehend not only the slightest deviation from the creed of the Church, but also usury, sorcery, contempt of the cross and clergy, dealings with Jews, etc. (The case of Galileo Galilei shows how heresy was understood. This distinguished astronomer (b. Pisa, Feb. 18, 1564; d. in the Villa Martellini, at Arceti, near Florence, Jan. 8, 1642) was tried by the Inquisition in Rome (June 21, 1633). The charge against him was, that he had adopted the Copernican theory, and had written in advocacy of its doctrines condemned in the decree of 1616; viz., that the sun is fixed in the centre of the world, and that the earth rotates. In reply, he said, that, since the Congregation of the Index had condemned it, he had not held the Copernican theory. The published documents of the Inquisition produced was the occasion of revolts; and death, either by a simple execution, or by cruel tortures. The property of the condemned party fell to the Inquisition, from whose sentence there was no appeal. The people in many places rose up against the inquisitors, as in Albi, and Narbonne (1234), and Toulouse; and in France, where the Inquisition had first been put in force, it was first abolished. In Germany, the Dominican Konrad Droso, and especially Conrad of Marburg (1231-33), were the most active agents of the Inquisition; but both were murdered, the latter at Marburg. The Emperor Frederick II., as a means of clearing himself of the charge of heresy, issued from Ravenna, in 1232, orders for carrying out the regulations of the Inquisition; but so determined was the resistance of the people, that its power was felt only in a few rare cases in the century that followed. About the middle of the fourteenth century, Urban appointed inquisitors to proceed against the Beghards in Constance, Speier, Erfurt, and Magdeburg. In 1372 Gregorv XI. placed the number at five for all Germany, and in 1399 Boniface IX. appointed six for Northern Germany alone. Many were put to death, even during the progress of the Reformata, in consequence of the famous Malefia maleficorum ("The Witches' Hammer," Cologne, 1489), which was put forth by the Pope at the instance of two inquisitors (Heinrich Kramers and Jacob Sprenger). The Jesuits sought to restore the Inquisition in Bavaria (1568), and during the Thirty-Year's War it found an occasional victim; but Maria Theresa abolished it in her kingdom, and it soon afterwards disappeared in Germany.

The Inquisition had no hold in England, Sweden, Norway, or Denmark; but in Spain, Portugal, and Italy it grew and grew. In the thirteenth century it was introduced into Aragon against the Moors and Jews. Nicolau Eymericus (d. 1389) was inquisitor-general for forty-four years, and wrote the Inquisitor's Manual (Directorum Inquisitionum), which states with appalling distinctness the rules regulating the methods of procedure. They were first put into full practice by Cardinal Ximenes, at the union of Castile and Aragon by the marriage of Ferdinand and Isabella. Hefele, in his Life of Ximenes, and in the art. Inquisition, in Wetzer and Welte, has shown how the methods of the Inquisition were in some respects less cruel than those of the criminal courts of the day; but it fails to prove that the Spanish Inquisition originated with the State rather than with the Church. The one to give complete organization to the movement in Spain was the bloody Domingo de Torquemada, who (in 1483) was appointed inquisitor-general.

His associates received the most definite instructions, and surrounded themselves with spies, the so-called "Familars of the Holy Office." The most noble in the land offered themselves for this service in order to secure their own persons. The terror which the horrible punishments of the Inquisition produced was the occasion of revolts and occasional assassinations of the inquisitors; but it continued to rage, the king himself using it to extend his authority, and fill his treasury. In 1482 all the Jews who refused to become Christians were compelled to emigrate; and a similar edict was passed upon the Moors under Torquemada's successor, Diego Deza (1499-1506). Under the third inquisitor-general, Ximenes (1507-17), according to Llorente, 2,536 were put to death, 1,946 burned in effigy, and 47,263 punished in other ways. Each of the three inquisitors, besides assessors, secretaries, familiars, and other officers. The place of meeting was called the "holy house" (casa santa). If the accused appeared, he was carefully examined, and placed in a dark prison. His head was shorn; his property, especially his books, inventoried; his income usually confiscated; and so terrible was the fear the tribunal inspired, that not even the accused's nearest friends dared to appear in his defence. Immediate avowal and renunciation of heresy secured to the party immunity from the sentence of death, but seldom averted the loss of property and confinement. In spite of his renunciation, the accused was obliged, for a certain period, to wear the San benito (a shirt without sleeves, and bearing a red St. Andrew's cross on the back and on the breast). On the other hand, the denial of the charge of heresy seldom saved the release of the prisoner; and extreme tortures were applied to extort a confession. If these failed, artifice was used to entrap the accused; and, where all means were exhausted, the victim was put to death at once, or condemned to a miserable life in prison.
sentence of death was enforced by the civil arm, and the accused was usually burnt alive. He was taken, in a solemn procession, to the public square, and the Auto da fé (act of faith) was consummated.

Under Charles I. the Cortes sought for a modification of the laws of the Inquisition; but under Philip II. the flames burned brightly again, at first in Seville and Valladolid (1559 sq.). But by the end of the seventeenth century the relics of the Reformation were effaced, and the activity of the Inquisition became limited to the destruction of prohibited books, of which an Index had been prepared in 1558. Under Charles III., in 1770, an edict was passed, securing an accused party from arbitrary imprisonment; and other regulations were passed, curtailing the powers of the Inquisition, until, in 1808, Joseph Napoleon abolished it entirely. In 1814 Ferdinand VII. restored it; but the popular rage in 1820 destroyed the inquisitor's palace at Madrid, and the Cortes again abolished it. But in 1825, by the efforts of the clergy, another inquisitorial commission was appointed. It continued till 1834, when it was finally abolished, and its property applied to the payment of the public debt. But it may be a long while before the country will revive from the effects of the court, which, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, extinguished her active literary life, and placed this nation, so richly endowed, almost outside of the circle of European civilization. Spain, it is true, remained free from heresies and religious wars; but her rest was the rest of the grave, so far as religious vitality was concerned.

The fortunes of the Inquisition in Portugal were similar to those which it had in Spain. In the reign of John VI. (1818-26) it was finally abolished. The last relics of the Italian Inquisition disappeared at the unification of the nation. The Congregation of the Inquisition at Rome, appointed by Sixtus V. in 1587, is all that remains of it. In its day it likewise had crushed out the Reformation, and had raged the most fearfully in Venice; but there its activity seems to have ceased in 1781, and in 1808 Napoleon abolished it. Reestablished under Pius VII. in 1814, it directed its energies to prevent the diffusion of the Italian Bible, and to check the introduction of evangelical truth. In the Netherlands, where the Inquisition was first introduced in the thirteenth century, it became a terrible weapon in the time of the Reformation. In 1521 Charles V. passed a rigorous edict against heretics, and appointed Franz van der Hulst inquisitor-general. In 1525 three inquisitors-general were appointed, in 1537 the number was increased to four, and in 1545 one was appointed for each of the provinces. According to Grotius, a hundred thousand victims died under Charles V.; according to the Prince of Orange, fifty thousand. Both computations are too large. In the Netherlands the inquisitors developed the most zeal; and the Duke of Alva, in 1567, appointed the Bloody Council, which proceeded with unheard-of cruelty against those whose wealth excited their avarice, or whose heresy aroused their suspicion. In 1573 Alva was recalled; and three years later the provinces concluded the League of Ghent, whose fifth article abolished the edicts against heresy.
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NEUBERGER (BENRATH). INQUISITION designates the influence of the Holy Ghost upon the writers of the Scriptures, by which they have become the expression of God's will to us. The term comes from the Vulgate translation of 2 Tim. iii. 16: Omnis scripture divinitu inspirata ("All scripture divinely inspired"). The Greek word ἀνευρενωρος, of which "inspired" is the translation, does not occur in classical or profane Greek,—its occurrence in Plutarch (De placit. phil. 5, 2) being in all probability an error of the copyist,—but seems to have been used for the first time, in writing, in 2 Tim. iii. 16. The word sometimes had the passive meaning of "endowed with God's Spirit" (Sibyll. 5, 406; Vita Saba, 16); but here, after the analogy of ἀνευρενωρος ("breathing ill"), etc., the meaning seems to be "breathing the divine Spirit," and not, with the Vulgate, "given by the divine Spirit." The latter interpretation has in favor that the word has that meaning when joined with ἀνευρενωρος ("man"); but the former suits better with the context "profitable for instruction," etc. (v. 15), and the usual mode of speaking of the Scripture as the word of the Holy Ghost (Acts xxviii. 25, etc.). Origen seems to have understood it in this sense when he said the "holy written Spirit" (sacra volumina spiritus plenitudinem spirant, Hom. 21 in Jerem.). The Fesitico, on the other hand, and the Ethiopic versions, understand it as meaning "inspired by God," the former translating it: "Every scripture which is written in the Spirit" (av ειναι εν τοις ινους). A well-defined doctrine of inspiration cannot be said to have existed until after the Reforma-
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The earliest views on inspiration in the Church leaned upon the Alexandrian theology much more than upon the Jewish. The Talmudic and Alexandrian Judaism agreed in ascribing a peculiar authority to the Old Testament. The former held that the Thora, or Law, was of immediate divine origin. God wrote it with his own hand, or dictated it to Moses as his amanuensis. Although some teachers were inclined to regard Joshua as the author of the account of Moses' death (Deut. xxxiv. 5), others held that Moses was the author, and wrote it with tears. The other writers of the Old Testament were not inspired in the same degree; and the Jewish theologians of the middle ages taught that the prophetic books were written by the spirit of prophecy, and the Hagiographa by the spirit of holiness, and that the writers of the latter exercised their individuality to a larger extent than the former (Laurent). Josephus and the canonic books were all written before the close of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, 425 B.C. (c. Ap. 1, 8); but both he and Philo speak of a continuance of the gift of prophecy, the latter ascribing it to every pious and wise man. All the writers of the Old Testament were prophets, and, as such interpreters of the divine will, unconscious of what they spoke. They were in an ecstatic condition, or trance (στάσις μαυαδία), both when they spoke and wrote, and were simply the passive organs of the Spirit of God.

The Scriptures recognize an ecstatic condition; but it is something different from the ecstasy of Philo, except, perhaps, in the case of Balaam, who prophesied against his will. It is not, as Augustine has rightly said, a suspension of the mental faculties (alienatio a mente), but an "alienation of the mind from physical sense-perception" (alienatio mentis a sensibus corporis). The Hellenistic or Philonic theory, therefore, was not derived either from Scripture or from Jewish theology proper, but rather from heathen sources. Hellenism alone knew of an ecstasy (στάσις μαυαδία), as Philo defined it. He got it, undoubtedly, from Plato, who regarded a divine enthusiasm (ευκομάχεια) or ecstasy as the primal fount of philosophy where the inspiration was drawn, but differed from Plato in holding that the individual consciousness was entirely lost.

These are the views we meet with in the writings of the early Church. The apostolic fathers supposed the fact of inspiration; but the apologetic writers of the second century, such as Justin Martyr (Coh. ad Graec. 8, 10; Apol. I. 36) and Athenagoras (Leg. 8, 42), emphasized the divine origin of the Scriptures, and give the impression that the Church was only following the example of the ancient wisdom teachers. This view was advocated by the Montanists; and it is to the opposition of the Church to them that we are indebted for the prevalence of sounder views of inspiration. Milliades, an apologetic writer, wrote a work against Montanism, opposing the view that the prophets spoke in an ecstatic condition, or trance (πολιποτου μοι δειν προφητην εν κοινων σαλιν, Euseb., H. E., 5, 17); and Clement of Alexandria regarded such a condition as an evidence of false prophets and an evil spirit (Strom. 1, 311). After Origen, the Church teachers emphatically denied that the prophets were in a state of unconsciousness when they spoke. They did not limit the influence of the Holy Spirit upon the biblical authors, but admitted their independence, to which more than form and style are attributed. But they did not attempt to reconcile the divine and human factors; and both Ireneus (Ad. heter. III. 16, 2) and Augustine (De cons. ev. I. 16, 12), while speaking of the apostles as writing down what they remembered, at the same time compared them to the hands which wrote down what Christ dictated. Jerome discovers solemnia in Scripture (Ep. ad. Eph. II. ad 3, 1); and Origen goes farther, when he distinguishes between the contents of Scripture, which are always true, and its language, in which the writers, who carefully elaborated their style, sometimes made mistakes. Origen gave more attention to the discussion of the nature of inspiration than any of the other fathers; and, according to him, it included an elevated activity of the human mind and the intervention of the Spirit calling the former forth. In the Church of Antioch the human side was made prominent; and Theodore of Mopsuestia held that Job was a poem which had sprung up on heathen soil; but in the Western Church the councils, as well as the Church itself, came to regard the doctrine of inspiration in a certain sense inspired. At a later period, when Agobard of Lyons (d. 840) affirmed that the biblical writers did not always observe the laws of grammar, the abbot Fredegis of Tours went so far in his reply as to say that the Holy Ghost formed the very words themselves in the mouths of the apostles (etiam ipsa corpora verba ex insinu in orae apostolorum).

Scholasticism manifested no special interest in the doctrine of inspiration, although Anselm laid aside many nights, meditating how the prophets could look upon the future as though it were the present; and Thomas of Aquinas made a distinction between revelation and inspiration. The latter recognized different grades of inspiration among the prophets of the Old Testament; so that David knew more than Moses. The principle was, that, the nearer they lived to the advent of Christ, the greater was the inspiration which they received. The Holy Spirit used the tongue of the speaker, but did not destroy his independent activity. The authority of the Scriptures was universally acknowledged; and only Abelard thought of asserting that the prophets and apostles were not always free from error, quoting Gal. ii. 11 sqq. in support of the assertion.

The Reformation emphasized the authority, and encouraged the use, of the Scriptures. No one thought of denying their authority. The only question was as to their meaning and application. This explains the absence of all discussion of the nature of inspiration by the Reformers. Luther, on the one hand, regarded the Bible as a book on "a letter or title of which more hung than upon heaven and earth," but, on the other hand, speaks of it as containing hay, straw, and stubble, of an insufficiency in Paul's argument (Gal. iv. 22 sqq.), etc. He regarded the Holy Spirit as the author of Scripture, but recognized the writers by their peculiar characteristics, and asserts that they poured out their whole heart into their words. Calvin held the same views. In the Scriptures we hear, as it were, the very voice of God; but he does not shrink from speak-
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The Confessions emphasized the supreme authority of Scripture, but did not investigate the nature of inspiration; nor did Gerhard (d. 1637), even in his richer treatment, go so far in the doctrine of inspiration as did the author of the theory which is usually denominated the Orthodox Protestant theory. According to him, inspiration is the form which revelation assumes, and nothing exists in the Scriptures which was not divinely suggested and inspired (dictatus suspicatur et inspiratum). Quenstedt, Baier, Hollaz, and others followed, affirniing that the writers were dependent upon the Spirit for their very words, and denying that there were any solecisms in the New Testament. The Buxtord extended inspiration to the vowel-ints of the text of Scripture, but did not investigate the nature of the Old Testament. This view was adopted in the sixteenth century, it is Schleiermacher’s merit to have emphasized the human element in the composition of the Scriptures. Twesten renewed the supernatural theory of the seventeenth century, it is Schleiermacher’s merit to have emphasized the human element in the composition of the Scriptures. Twesten renewed the supernatural theory of the seventeenth century, without its exaggerations; and Beck regarded it as an essential element in the “organism of Revelation,” and not to be confounded with revelation.

Both he and Philippi conceived of it as illumination; the latter defining it as “that influence of the Spirit by which the mind is wholly transferred into the sphere of revelation, and is fitted to report the special subject exactly, or as that communication of the human mind with the mind of the Spirit by which the revelation of the latter becomes, without adulteration, the thought of the former.” Rothe defined inspiration as the momentary condition of the soul by which it is enabled to understand and to infallibly interpret revelation. The inspiration of the apostles was only the increased measure of the Spirit indwelling in them, and the Scriptures are simply the outflowing of the divine life of their authors.

As we said at the beginning, inspiration means something different from the Greek ἐνθολή ("breathing the divine Spirit"). It refers to the origination, the latter to the contents, of the Bible. But, if the Bible breathes the Spirit of God, then it must have received this characteristic from God. If it breathes his Spirit in a peculiar manner, then it must have received it in a peculiar way. We are therefore justified in speaking of a special influence of the Spirit upon the authors of the Scriptures. For this idea the Church has coined the term “inspiration.” The first question is, whether the Scriptures do really breathe the Holy Spirit in a peculiar manner. This is a matter of experience (an experience of faith), just as God’s nature is a matter of experience; but this experience must be of the nature of a universal one for all religiously disposed persons, and such we find it to be. It is and has been the experience of the Church with reference to the Scriptures as a whole; and the Church has regarded them as the infallible standard of religious life, and the absolutely pure spring of all religious convictions derived from them. The Scriptures, however, contain the revelation of salvation: their authors, therefore, must have stood in peculiar relations to the Holy Spirit. Of what nature this relation was can only be ascertained from the history of salvation as it is found in the Scriptures themselves. This relation varies at different times, and is modified by the relative nearness of the parties to God. The distinction between the inspiration of the Old and New Testaments is brought out by the words used in the two cases. It is uniformly said of the prophets, that the “word of the Lord came to,” or the “word of the Lord which . . . saw” (Isa. ii. 1; Amos i. 1, etc.). In the New Testament the word of the Lord was revealed through Christ (Acts x. 38; Rom. x. 5–8; Tit. i. 3, etc.). Here, in order to apprehend the revelation of God in Christ, only a relation of faith to Christ is necessary (Luke x. 24; 1 Pet. i. 10; Matt. x. 17). The preparation to be a witness for Christ is a fruit of a personal relation to him (Matt. x. 27; John xv. 15).

The attestation of the gospel is conditioned upon the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the witness; but it is a special calling, and, like every ecclesiastical service, requires a special preparation by the Holy Spirit. Every one who is regenerated is not inspired, but every one who is inspired is regenerated. Inspiration, therefore, is the charism which fitted the apostles, in spite of their personal imperfections (comp. Gal. ii. with 1 Cor. ix. 16 sqq.), to announce authoritatively, and for all time, the facts of salvation and their meaning. If a special preparation was necessary under the new dispensation, much more so was it under the old. Here the influence of inspiration might be exercised upon persons in whom the Spirit did not dwell as a vital and constant principle. Again: the inspiration, at least of the prophets, was a temporary endowment; that of the apostles, an abiding one; and the former suffered from the same defects of spiritual experience as their contemporaries (2 Cor. xii. 9; 1 Pet. i. 10, 11). Under the old covenant the...
writers had to be prepared to interpret the meaning of history with reference to salvation. The knowledge of historical facts they got in the usual way; and if it be true that the preparation of the Spirit extended only to the interpretation, and not to the acquisition, of historical facts, then we can easily explain their divergences in matters of chronological sequence, the attendant circumstances, etc.

The activity of the Holy Spirit is, therefore, neither limited nor made impossible by the independence and peculiarities of the biblical writers, as was thought in the seventeenth century, but made possible and advanced by it. Inspiration is the very opposite of a suspension of human independence. It rather confirms and sanctifies it. The gift of inspiration does not stand out of relation to the facts, either of the human past, the present, or the future. It belongs among the charisms of the Church; was a preparation for giving the testimony of the gospel, and not merely for writing the Scriptures; and was confined to the earliest period of the Church.

Hermann CREMER.

In view of the great importance of the subject discussed in this article, it is desirable, without repeating what has already been said, to bring out some of its aspects a little more sharply, and to emphasize some further considerations. In general, it may be said that the theory of the mode and degree (as distinct from the fact) of inspiration, although of great importance, is "not fundamental to the truth of Christianity" (Professor A. A. Hodge: Presb. Rev. for 1881, p. 227).

I. Inspiration and the Canon. — Our present canon does not necessarily measure the extent of inspiration. Both must be determined by the same process, upon the basis of the contents of the books, the statements of their authors, their relation to Christ (in the New Testament), and the judgment of the Church. It is evident that a book belonging to our present canon may not be inspired. Seven books of the New Testament were disputed in the Church of the early centuries, and are hence called Antilegomena by Eusebius, as distinct from the Homologomena, which were universally accepted as canonical. The Roman-Catholic canon of the Old Testament still includes the Apocrypha, which are rejected by Protestants. Luther doubted the inspiration of Esther (see art.), and held an unfavorable view of the Epistle of James and the Apocalypse. Calvin expressed doubts about 2 Peter. The Bible is an organism; and, though to one part inspiration be denied, the inspiration of the whole is not thereby infringed upon. Three classes of objections are urged: (1) It is hard to explain the divergences (not contradictions) in the Gospels when the narratives refer to the same facts or to the same discourses of our Lord. Consider, for example, the four forms in which the superscription on the cross is given, or the words of our Lord to the disciples on the lake. Matthew (viii. 25—27) reports the latter
The force of this consideration led Osiander (Harm. Evv., Basel, 1537), who held a high theory of inspiration, to assume that Peter's wife's mother was healed of the fever three times! (4) It is very difficult to understand why the New Testament was not usually quoted in the Septuagint translation, and not the original Hebrew of the Old Testament (comp. Acts ii. 16-21, etc.). In many cases the divergence from the Hebrew text is great; as in the quotation which James made at the Council of Jerusalem, in other passages of the Acts, and in many passages of the Epistle to the Hebrews (which always claimed.

The inspiration of the New Testament is likewise proved by its own testimony, the apostles insisting upon the infallibility of their words (1 Cor. ii. 1105). The grace of God was in them as earthen vessels. The same may be said of the Scriptures. They are a human vase in which the divine revelation is contained. They are God's book, and yet man's composition; and the subtle inter-relation of the human and divine elements is as difficult of explanation as that of God and man in the work of salvation (Phil. ii. 15, 19), or that of the soul and the body. (4) It removes a hinderance out of the way of many who would gladly believe the Bible to contain the word of God, if it were not necessary to give their assent to all its historical statements. (See excellent remarks by Morell. p. 169.) Many can believe the discourses of our Lord in John (xii. sqq.) to be divine who cannot so regard the list of the Dukes of Edom (Gen. xxxvi. 15-43), or all the tables of the Books of Chronicles, or the exact number killed for looking into the ark,—50,070 (1 Sam. vi. 19). It may be said that we would thus be embarrassed to know what is and what is not inspired. The objection is to some extent well founded; but in this case, as in men's individual relations to Christ, they are left to exercise their judgment, guided by the Holy Spirit. (5) This view makes the absence of an absolutely pure text intelligible. The autographs of the apostles do not exist; and we may speak reverently in saying that this might have been expected, if the letter of Scripture were the work of the Spirit. III. Proofs of Inspiration.—The passage "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God" (2 Tim. iii. 16) is often quoted as a proof of the inspiration of all the canonical books. The meaning of the term geistverwirfung has been discussed above. Here it is sufficient to say that the passage has reference to the books of the Old Testament, and that the translation making it a dogmatic statement is probably incorrect. The Revised Version gives the true rendering: "Every scripture inspired of God is," etc. The proofs of inspiration are as follows: (1) The statements of Scripture itself. In the Old Testament the authors testify to the divine origin of their message by such expressions as the "word of the Lord came," or the "Lord spake by his servant." The prophets were specially called (Jer. i. 8, etc.). The inspiration of the writers of the Old Testament is also proved by the terms applied to their writings in the New Testament (Rom. i. 2; 2 Tim. iii. 16, etc.), the explicit statements of our Lord (Matt. iv. 4, xxii. 29; Luke x. 28) and his apostles (Heb. i. 2), their frequent quotations from it, and our Lord's proof of its infallibility from its utterances (John v. 39; Luke xxiv. 27, etc.).
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13; 1 Thess. ii. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 13), and by the Lord's promise to them of a special endowment of the Spirit (John xiv. 26, xvi. 13; comp. 1 Cor. vii. 40, etc.), and a supernatural supply of wisdom and words (Matt. x. 20; Luke xxi. 13). Christ, it is true, did not appoint scribes; but he appointed ministers, and promised to them a miraculous presence and power. (2) The nature of the contents. The inherent excellences of Scripture (as in the case of the person of Christ) are sufficient witnesses to its heavenly origin. The unity of the book, unfolding a single purpose; its elevated tone; the faultless character of Christ; the nature of the facts revealed of God, the soul, and the future,—all stamp it as a work of more than ordinary human genius or insight. This testimony is, for most minds, the strongest of all. It is the testimony of the Holy Spirit in the experience. The more familiar," says Doddridge, "one becomes with these books, the more will one be struck with this evidence;" and Van Oosterzee well says, "He who will acknowledge in Scripture no higher than a purely human character comes into collision, not only with our Lord's word and that of his witnesses, but also with the Christian consciousness of all ages," etc. (Dogmatics, p. 199). (3) The a priori proof. This argument is hardly less strong than the previous ones, for minds which hold that God has given to such a revelation, he would make special provision for its infallible communication.


INSTALLATION denotes generally the ceremonial act by which a person ordained and appointed is formally put into possession of an ecclesiastical benefice, but is in the English Church sometimes applied specially to the office of a canon or prebendary, or the enunciation of a minister. The induction of a minister, high or low, was formed in Germany about 1700, under the influence of the prophets of the Camisards. Driven out of France, those enthusiasts went first to England, then to the Netherlands, and finally to Germany, where they found many adherents, not only among the French refuges, but soon also among the natives. Congregations were formed in Halle (1714); and a number of German prophets arose, the most prominent among whom were E. L. Gruber and J. F. Rock. Especially in the neighborhood of Wetterau, Wittgenstein, and Wied, where the country swarmed with separatists of all kinds, the movement gained strength; and in the second decade of the eighteenth century congregations of the Inspired were found in Hesse, the Palatinate, Württemberg, and Saxony. In doctrine they differed not so very much from the evangelical churches, though they believed in continuous inspiration; but their ideas of discipline and organization separated them completely from any established church. In their congregations there was no office of teacher or preacher. Their service consisted of free prayers, singing, and recital of Gruber's Die 24 Regeln der wahren Gottesseligkeit und heiligen Wandels, and prophecies, if any were given. Rock was the last medium of inspiration among them; and after his death, in 1749, the movement gained strength; and in the second decade of the present century, when new prophets arose among them. The Hessian and Prussian governments, however, saw fit to interfere with the prophets; and in 1841 a considerable emigration (about eight hundred souls) took place. The immigrants went to America, where they formed a flourishing colony at Ebenezer, in the State of New York. They afterwards left that place, and settled in Iowa. See M. GOEBELL: Gesch. d. wahren Inspirationsgemeinden, in Zeit. f. hist. Theol., 1854, II., III.; 1855, 1, III.

INTEGRATION denotes the act of one who endeavors to reconcile persons at variance, or of one who pleads for another. The act is often performed among men, and constitutes one of the good traits of our fallen humanity. But theologically it is used of the work of Christ, and improperly of deceased saints. Christ is set forth in Scripture as our intercessor. It is his function as his priest; and therefore, in his wondrous prayer before his death, he remembers us all (John xvii. 11, 20). He appears in the presence of God for us (Heb. ix. 24), and makes intercession for us (Rom. vii. 25): he is therefore denominated our HYPERSONIC INTERCESSION. He pleads the shedding of his blood, and thus obtains the pardon of our sins. His intercession is "authoritative" (he intercedes not without right: John xvii. 24), wise (he understands the nature...
of his work and the wants of his people: John ii. 25, righteous (for it is founded upon justice and the constitution, and occurs under a triple form, personal, professional, and clerical, developed from the excommunication of saints, and particularly the Virgin Mary, are pronounced it, or his superior. See Konsn, in Archiv Julius I. (337-352) as unscriptural.

**INTRODUCTION.**

**INTRODUCTION. I. Old Testament.** — Widely different opinions exist respecting the idea and treatment of this branch of theological study. On the one hand, J. G. Carpoz (Introductiz, Leipzig, 1721), and at a much later date De Wette, even in the last edition of his Introduction, which he edited (7th edition, Berlin, 1852), maintained that it properly concerned all that helped to make the Scriptures intelligible. On the other hand, Reusch (R. C.) includes under the term only the origin of the several books, their collection (canon), inspiration, and preservation; and Keil defines Old-Testament Introduction as the knowledge of those underlying historic-critical principles of the Old-Testament canon which explain and justify its theological use by Jew and Christian. Franz Kaufen (R. C.), in the logical wake of Keil, assigns Introduction to dogmatic theology as a branch of apologetics. Richard Simon expressed the right idea in his Histoire critique du neuz testament (Paris, 1678), that it was an historical science, and accordingly he treats of the history of the text, etc.; but unhappily he was not faithful to his own principles. Hupfeld (1844) suggested making Introduction a history of the Old-Testament writings. Such a history would not necessarily be the same as a biblical Hebrew literary history, although Hupfeld, J. J. Thalheim, and Delitzsch would so consider it; for the latter properly is a history of the literary development of the old Hebrews, as displayed in their literature, while the former has to do with the origin and history of that collection of books we style the "Old Testament."

The idea, of course, directly affects the treatment. When Old-Testament Introduction is considered as a collection of important facts bearing upon the interpretation and estimation of the Old Testament, it is divided into two parts, general and special. General Introduction treats of the original languages of the Old Testament, the versions, the history and criticism of the text, the history of the canon; special Introduction, of the contents, origin, and credibility of the separate books. But if Old-Testament Introduction be looked at as a history of the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament, then it comprises the origin of the single writings, the history of their collection, of their canonicity, and, finally, of their transmission and spread with a canonical
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authority. A historico-critical treatment of the matter is throughout obligatory.

As an independent discipline, Old-Testament Introduction is comparatively recent; for the ancient Church had no interest in merely scientific questions respecting the Scriptures. Jerome gives some valuable materials, and Adrianus' tract (elec. de r. sac. ver.) (fifth century, published first by Hoeschel, 1602, and in Critici sacri, London, probably gave the name to the science; but hermeneutics, rather than introduction, was served.


II. New Testament. — What we mean by Introduction was not studied in the Early Church. There was no felt necessity to learn about the origin, the inducing causes, the immediate divine signs, and the histories of the New-Testament books. Even the presence of the apocryphal books, and of the heretics who had composed them, or who had departed from the canon, while it increased the reverence of the Church for those books known to be the genuine writings of the apostles and evangelists, led to much study and research in this department in the first two centuries. Dionysius of Alexandria (third century) may be called the father of New-Testament historical criticism; for he contested the claim of John the apostle to be the author of the Revelation, while
formally granting its canonicity. The incitement to critical consideration of the books of the New Testament had, however, been previously given by the discovery, when the Church came into more active intercourse, that some of these books had experienced different treatment in different places. For instance, the Epistle to the Hebrews, which the Alexandrian Church had accepted as Pauline, was found to be little known in other equally orthodox churches, and, indeed, in most was considered un-Pauline and even uncanonical; and the Shepherd of Hermas, it was found, was greatly valued in some churches, while in others it was little esteemed. Local tradition was thus robbed of its value; and the necessity of a critical comparison of these ecclesiastical traditions was felt by the Palestinian branch of the school of Origen. Eusebius’ study of the primitive Christian literature was displayed in a comprehensive collection of the older witness for and against the uncontroverted portions of the New Testament; and by so doing he rendered a valuable service, although his intention to substantiate certain prejudices respecting the limits of the canon destroys the objectivity of his information. From him, however, we have received pretty much all we know of the older tradition concerning the origin of the universally accepted books. Jerome followed in his steps, but added nothing, except a little about the difference between the Oriental and Occidental canons and the Gospel of the Hebrews. The dogmatic controversies of the fourth and following centuries diverted attention from critical questions; and what had been previously gained was merely repeated in the introductions to commentaries, catenas, and similar works.

But from the Revival of Learning began a better day for New-Testament Introduction. The works of Santes Pagninus (1536), Sixtus of Siena (1586), and A. Rivetus (1627), contained much information in this department, along with dogmatical considerations, and the new study of textual criticism gave great impetus. Richard Simon (1638-1712) published his three works upon the critical history of the New Testament (Histoire critique du N. T., Rotterdam, 1689-93), and thus won his place as the father of New-Testament Introduction. By critique he understood the investigations for the establishment of the original text; and, by his history from the sources, he disproved not only the Protestant claim of “a witness of the Spirit,” but also the scholastic treatment, which, resting upon imperfect acquaintance with antiquity, could not prove that Christianity was a religion based on facts, and that the Bible was the record of those facts.

The next name to be mentioned is Johann David Michaelis (1717-1791), who wrote the Einleitung in die göttlichen Schriften des Neuen Bundes (Göttingen, 1750). He described the dependence on the Gospels, and the textual criticism, by Mill, Bengel, and Wetstein, had much been done (his work was really, in its first shape, based upon Simon). With each succeeding edition it was greatly improved; and, even in the fourth and last edition (1798), its standpoint was a strongly rational supernaturalism. The differences to be noted between the editions are mainly, that his attacks on the “doubters” became milder, and that he preferred at last to give up the inspiration of the historical books, denied also the inspiration of the non-apostolic books (among which he reckoned apparently the Epistle to the Hebrews), and, indeed, flatly declared that the “inner witness of the Spirit” was of as little worth as the witness of the Church, in proof of the inspiration of any book.

Johann Salomo Semler (1725-1791) made the next contribution of importance (in his Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Kanons, Halle, 1771-75, 4 parts), when he distinguished between the word of God, which contained the doctrines of directly spiritual value, and the Holy Scriptures, which contained them only sporadically. There is, however, no historical proof that any particular passage was the word of God; the inner witness for the truth was the only source of proof. The Church had the right, exercised by the ancient Church and by the reformers, to say what books should constitute her canon. One cannot say that Introduction was inuenced permanently by Semler: rather we must give the following work, by J. E. Chr Schmidt (1804), Eichhorn (1808), and Hug (1808). Schmidt applied the phrase “historico-critical”—since so widely used—to his Introduction; Eichhorn started his “original gospel” theory; Hug, in an unexcelled manner, investigated the relations of the synoptists. Schleiermacher (1811) called attention to the need of a reconstruction of this branch of study, declaring that its object was a history of the New Testament, so that its present readers might be, in their knowledge of the origin of the books and their text, on a level with the first. This idea—to write a history of the New Testament—has been carried out by Cremer (1836), Reuss (1842), and Hupfeld (1844); so also by Davidson (1868) and Hilgenfeld (1875), under the old name “Introduction.”

Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792-1860) has had by far the most influence upon New-Testament studies of any man of modern times. He attempted nothing less than a reconstruction of all apostolic and post-apostolic history and literature, in the face of all ecclesiastical and scholarly tradition, from the four Pauline Epistles (Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Romans), which alone he considered genuine. Starting with the idea that the difference between Paul and the rest of the apostles was fundamental, he declared that those New-Testament writings which either put the relations of the apostles in a more favorable light, or seemed to ignore their differences, were either forgeries, or the products of a later time. But his historical considerations were derived from Hegel’s philosophy, and his criticism rested upon dogmatic convictions. These four points may be made against him: (1) He reasoned in a circle; for he examined critically, first the sources of the history, and then the history of the sources. The reasoning which reduced the genuine Pauline Epistles to four reduces the four to none; so that Paul is robbed of his title to have produced any writing which lasted. (2) Baur certainly was extraordinarily familiar with the old Christian literature; but he read it with prejudices, and not
with a desire to learn any thing different from his preconceptions. (6) He was lacking in the sense of the concrete and the value of the individual, and therefore could not grasp complicated relations and their results. (4) If it is self-evident that one must understand what he criticises, and that his criticism must rest upon thorough exegesis, then Baur surely was unfit for his labor; for he was anything rather than an exegete, and his school has done nothing in exegesis. It should, however, be added, that these defects in Baur's method of work were supplied by others; and that the result of the operations of friend and foe is a much better understanding of the New Testament.


INTROIT. The name, in the Roman Church, for the anthem sung at the beginning of the communion service. Its origin is obscure. According to the Liber Pontificalis, it was introduced by Celestine in 423. See the art. by W. E. Scudamore, in Smith and Cheetham, Dict. of Chr. Antiq., vol. 1, pp. 865-867.


INVESTITURE. In the Frankish monarchy the idea gradually became prevalent, that the ruler of the realm had the right to appoint bishops; and in Germany the kings clung so much more tenaciously to this idea, as, in course of time, the bishoprics and abbacies there entirely changed their original character of being merely ecclesiastical organizations, and became, to all intents and purposes, political divisions, with rights of coinage, toll, jurisdiction, etc., and with corresponding duties, especially of a military description. When a bishop died, his staff and ring were brought from his residence to the king; and, when the king had made up his mind with respect to the choice of a successor, he put the new bishop or abbot into possession of the temporalities of the fief by investing him with the staff and the ring, and receiving his homage, or oath of fealty. After the investiture, there followed, as the last act in the installation, the consecration by the metropolitan; but that the latter should exercise more than an advisory influence on the whole transaction was out of the question.

Meanwhile, during the first half of the eleventh century, the ideas of the reform party in the Roman curia, concerning the perfect freedom of the Church from any secular power, began to assume definite shape. As the bishops and abbots used to offer great presents to the king on the occasion of their investiture, it was easy to throw a shadow of simony over the whole transaction; and the statutes of the ecclesiastical law concerning simony were very severe. As yet, however, no direct application was made. The curia spoke only in general terms when it forbade ecclesiastics to accept their offices from the hands of laymen; but in 1068 it came to an actual clash. The king appointed a bishop of Milan in the usual way,—by investiture; while the people, instigated by the curia, demanded a bishop canonically elected and instituted. As the king would not yield, a Roman synod of 1074 aggravated the severity of the laws concerning simony; and the next year Gregory VII. officially denied the king's
right of investiture, and admonished the people to oppose, in all their ecclesiastical functions, such bishops and abbots as had assumed their office in an uncanonical, simoniacal manner.

This meant for Germany the complete overthrow of its constitution. The bishops and abbots were princes of the empire, holding the larger mass of the imperial fiefs; and, as no dynamical claims could be put forward with respect to these fiefs, the king wielded an immense power through his right to give them to whom he pleased. It was evident that he would immediately break down before the Pope if he lost this right,—if the bishops and abbots of his realm should be canonically elected, that is, elected by a clergy, which, by the law of celibacy, was completely severed from the interests of the State, and transformed into mere tools of the Church. The contest was long, extremely bitter, and at times doubtful with respect to its issue. The first step was the concordat of Worms (1122), was in favor of the Pope. The emperor gave up altogether his right of investiture with ring and staff; and though he retained a certain influence on the elections, and the right of investiture with the so-called regalia, in its golden days the Church knew very well how to elude these latter obligations. The concordat of Worms continued in active operation until the dissolution of the German Empire in 1806.

In no other country did the controversy concerning the right of investiture reach such a pitch of intensity as in Germany,—partly because the popes knew that victory on one point would be victory all along the whole line, and were too shrewd to engage in an unnecessary warfare with the whole world at once; partly because the question nowhere else affected the political constitution so deeply. In France, where the bishops and abbots, though large fief-holders, were not princes of the empire, the kings renounced their right of investiture with ring and staff towards the close of the eleventh century; but no elections could take place without their permission, nor was it valid until it received their confirmation,—two points which secured to them a considerable influence. In England it came to a compromise between Paschal II. and Henry I. (1107), by which the king retained his right of nomination and of demanding an oath of fealty. Stephen, however, Henry's successor (1135–54), gave up his right of nomination; and in 1215 John repeated the renunciation. Nevertheless, practically the English chapters never obtained freedom in their elections.


INVOCATION OF SAINTS. See Image-Worship. IONA.

IONA, HY or HI, 1 or IA, IOUA, from which, by a mistake of a transcriber, the present name of Iona has come. It gets also the name of Icolmkill, or the Island of Columba of the Cell, and occasionally Inis van Druidheach, or Island of the Druids. It is one of the Outer Hebrides, lying north-east and south-west, and separated from the Ross, or south-western promontory of the Island of Mull, by a shallow channel about a mile in breadth. It is about three miles and a half in length, and one and a half in breadth; the rocks of igneous formation; the surface generally low, but rising into a number of irregular cones or knolls, not usually exceeding a hundred feet in height; the highest of them, which bears the name of Dun-i, or Dun-ii, and is situated on the north of the island, being about three hundred and thirty feet above the level of the sea. It has been variously estimated as containing from sixteen hundred to two thousand acres, much less than half of which are arable, and not more than six hundred actually under cultivation. The pastures on the sides of the knolls and ravines afford sustenance to about six hundred sheep, and from two to three hundred larger cattle. The population, according to the latest census, was two hundred and forty-three, and maintains itself partly by agriculture, and partly by fishing: the large founders in the neighboring seas being accounted unusually fine. The coast is diversified by a number of small rocky bays and headlands, and three or four landing-places,—Port-na-Currach, on the south-west, where Columba is supposed to have first landed; Port-na-Muintir on the south-east, the usual starting-point in crossing from Iona to Mull; and Port-na-Marbh, at which the bodies brought for burial in the island were landed. The island at the time of the Reformation appears to have constituted a distinct parish, but afterwards to have been united to the parish of Kilfinnichen in Mull, and only in our own day to have been re-erected into a parish quaod sacra. Besides the parish church and the school, there is also a Free Church.

That which for ages has attracted visitors from all quarters to this little island, and still holds them captive by a spell more powerful than the neighboring Staffa does by its grander scenery and greater scientific interest, is that it was once "the luminary of the Caledonian regions, whence," as Dr. Johnson says, "savage clans and roving barbarians derived the benefits of civilization and the blessings of religion." But though its attractions arise chiefly from its history, and it must yield to its neighbor in respect of the grandeur of its scenery and the marvels of its geological structure, it is by no means destitute of physical attractions as Montalembert has represented it to be. Mr. Skene, who knows it far better, has said, "No one who pays merely a flying visit to Iona in an excursion steamer, and is hurried by his guide over the nights, that he may return by the steamer the same day, can form any conception of the hidden beauties,—its retired dells, its long reaches of sand on shores indented with quiet bays, its little coves between bare and striking rocks, and the bolder rocky scenery of its north-western and south-western shores, where it opposes wild barren cliffs and high rocky islands to the sweep of the Atlantic waves." The Duke of Argyll fully concurs in the views of Mr. Skene. Even he who is most impressed with its higher claims, and feels most the force of Dr. Johnson's noble words, need not fail to own that Columba could hardly have found a spot combining more of the natural beauty he loved with the security he
sought, and in all respects so well adapted for an island monastery designed to form the centre of a great missionary work, and to exhibit the Christian life in contrast with the surrounding Paganism. These beauties seem to have been felt by him, especially those of the south-western corner, which Mr. Skene pronounces to be "the very perfection of rocky scenery," where was the Cuilnan Erin. From its summit the saint could look out on the wide ocean without catching a glimpse of the land of his birth, and might have had suggested to his mind the glowing imagery of the poem in which he revels on the delight of gaz ing from a pinnacle of rock on the face of ocean, with its heaving waves chanting music to their father, or more hourlessly thundering on the rocks.

It was in 563 that the island became the home of the saint, being given to him either by the king of the Dalriad Scots, or by the Picts, its more ancient possessors. It was well suited for a Celtic monastery, no less by its own limited size than by its proximity to larger islands and to the mainland, and it became not only the usual abode of Columba, but the head of all his monasteries and missions. From it as a centre he went out on many evangelistic tours, both to the islands and the mainland, till the kingdom of the Northern Picts was brought over to the Christian faith, and the faith as well as the fortunes of his own Scotic race were revived. From it missions went forth, or were sent, to more distant tribes and nations, and particularly to the Angles of Northumbria, to the Continent, to Iceland, and other hyperborean regions; and the blessings of civilization, learning, and religion, were extended far and wide.

The remains of the ancient church, nunnery, and monastery, now found in the island, belong to a much later age than that of Columba. The buildings erected by him, being, according to Scotch custom, of wood or wattles, have all disappeared many centuries ago, and their very site can now be but indistinctly pointed out. They were surrounded by a rampart, some portions of which can still be traced, and were not far from the Port-na-Muintir, or portus insult: of Adamnan, which is supposed to have been of oaken planks wattled; the cells of the monks; the little court in the centre; and the church or oratorium, which is supposed to have been of oaken planks or beams. The "domus," or cell of Columba, was built of planks, and occupied the highest part of the ground, not far from the Tar an Abb, from which he took his last survey of his community and their agricultural operations. There would seem also to have been a library, which Mr. Conno Innes supposes at a considerably later period still to have had manuscripts, which had probably been in its possession from these early times, and was of great value.

In the ninth and tenth centuries the island was repeatedly ravaged, the monastery destroyed, and part of its inmates slaughtered by the Danes and other northern rovers, and the primacy of the Scottish Columban churches was removed to Dunkeld. In the end of the eleventh century, when the Western Isles were formally ceded to Norway, the seat of the bishopric of the Isles was transferred from Iona to Man, and the diocese incorporated into the Norwegian archbishopric of Drontheim. In 1266, when the isles were restored to Scotland, the patronage of the diocese was restored also, but with reservation of the rights the Church of Drontheim could legitimately claim over it. In the following century the Island of Man was seized by Edward III., and its bishop swore allegiance to him. After 1389 the English appointed a bishop of Man, and the Scotch a bishop of the Isles; but no regular division of the diocese appears to have taken place. The later ecclesiastical buildings, of which remains still exist in the island, date mostly from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The most ancient, the temple or chapel of Oran or Odrain, may possibly be of the time of Queen Margaret. It is built of red granite, and has for its western doorway a Norman arch, with beak-headed ornament. Near it is the Reilig Oran, an ancient cemetery and sanctuary, said to have been formed by Columba for the burial of the Scotch and Pictish kings till the time of Malcolm the Third, and anciently to have contained three tumuli, appropriated respectively to the kings of Scotland, Ireland, and Norway, and in which forty-eight Scotch, four Irish, and eight Norwegian kings were buried. North of this cemetery are the remains of the medieval monastery of the thirteenth century, erected for the Benedictine monks who had succeeded the Celtic. In connection with the cloisters is a Norman arcade of somewhat older date. The abbey or cathedral church is supposed to have been erected also in the thirteenth century. It is built of red granite, and in cruciform shape, with nave, transpet, and choir, and with central tower rising to the height of seventy-five feet. The tower is said to have contained a fine peal of bells, two of which were carried off to Raphoe in Ireland, by Bishop Knox, when transferred to that see by James I. King Charles I. ordered Knox's successor to restore them; but whether this was actually done is not now known (Transactions of Iona Club, p. 157, Edinburgh, 1824).


Ireland. I. The Country. — Ireland is situated to the west of Great Britain. Its greatest length is three hundred miles, and its greatest width two hundred; its area, 32,535 square miles. The surface is an undulating plain, with a rim of low mountains round the coast. The climate is moist, variable but temperate, and better adapted to cattle-raising than to the cultivation of cereals. The manufactures are not important except that of linen in the north. The country is divided into the four provinces, Ulster, Leinster, Munster, and Connaught, and subdivided into...
IRELAND.

II. HISTORY. 1. To the Union of the Irish Church with Rome. — Ireland was at an early date settled by Celtic tribes, differing considerably among themselves, and maintaining constant warfare. The Irish clergy consisted of a Patriarch, who had jurisdiction over all the bishops, and of the bishops themselves. The early Irish Church was essentially monastic, and adapted to the state of society then existing among the early Celts. The former religion was what is vaguely known as "Druidism;" and the so-called "schools of the Druids" may have accustomed the Irish to the monastic idea. The tribal system was in full force; and, owing to this, a chief could not make an absolute gift of land to the Church: he could only make over his own rights, the clansmen retaining theirs. Such religious communities were called "monasteries," though only a few members may have taken vows of celibacy. The heads of such bodies were the real ecclesiastical rulers of Ireland; and we find presbyters, laymen, and (in one famous instance, that of St. Brigit) a woman, filling such positions, and in authority over bishops. That the bishops were not territorial in early times is shown by the facts that St. Patrick himself is traditionally reported to have ordained between three hundred and four hundred bishops for a population of probably not half a million persons, and that St. Mochta is said to have had one hundred bishops in his monastery. The history of the Irish Church for the next six centuries is the history of its gradual conformation to that of Rome. As the fruit of his labors, Dermod had no right to give In 1169 and '1170 the Norman knights landed in Ireland, and succeeded in firmly establishing themselves. In 1172 Henry visited Ireland, and received the country from Strongbow. A synod assembled at Cashel formally united the Church of Ireland to the Church of Rome; and so the last of the western national churches surrendered. And from this time until the Reformation, the history of the Irish Church is the history of the Roman-Catholic Church in Ireland.

2. From the Union of the Irish Church with that of Rome to the Reformation. — At first the advent of the Norman rulers was an unmixed benefit. To the tillers of the soil any strong rule was better than subjection to the exaction of every captain of banditti who could muster twenty men. But the Normans rapidly assimilated themselves to the Irish; and in a short time the only difference between the old and the new state of affairs was, that some of the clansmen now fought under Norman instead of Celtic leaders. In 1367, less than two hundred years from the landing of Strongbow, the Anglo-Irish Parliament assembled at Kilkenny passed a statute treating the old English settlers with almost as much severity as the Irish. Near the beginning of the fifteenth century considerable bodies of Celtic-Scottish invaders invaded Ulster. Like other invaders of Ireland, they found allies, and made permanent settlements.

During the wars of the Roses in England, Ireland was left almost to herself; and on the accession of Henry VII., although the most powerful families were of Anglo-Norman name, the authority of the king extended only to the country immediately surrounding Dublin. Henry, an able and astute monarch, sent over Sir Edward Poynings. A Parliament assembled by him in 1486 made all English statutes law in Ireland, and

thirty-two counties, comprising 316 baronies, with 2,532 parishes.
IRELAND.

subjected the Irish Parliament to the English privy council,—an arrangement which remained in force until within eighteen years of the union of the two countries.

Under the strong rule of Henry's deputy, the Earl of Kildare,—the head of the great family of the Geraldines,—the English authority was extended, the turbulence of the barons and native chiefs was checked, and the unhappy country enjoyed probably a greater degree of quiet than at any time since her history opened. This state of things continued through the early part of the reign of Henry VIII., broken only by the mad rebellion of "Silken Thomas," which ended in the ruin of the Kildare family.

3. From the Reformation to the Period of Protestant Ascendancy, and of the Penal Laws.—A new and all-important factor is now introduced into Irish history. Henry VIII. extended his reformation to Ireland. Up to this time the Irish Church had been directly under the control of Rome. The Pope appointed the archbishops, and the king of England was seldom able to enforce his claim to any authority in ecclesiastical matters. At the time of the Reformation the Irish Church was as corrupt as any in Europe. Simony, lawlessness, and sexual immorality characterized the clergy. Nowhere was reform more needed; but unfortunately the worst side of the Reformation was turned to Ireland, and it could scarcely have happened otherwise than that it should be rejected by the mass of the people. The Irish were now beginning to realize that the power of England was real, and was to be exerted to crush out their tribal institutions, and substitute the common law of England for that of the Brehon lawyers. Northmen and Danes, Norman barons and Celtic Scotch, had all been welcomed as allies by some Irish power, and had been absorbed till they became "more Irish than the Irish." But under Henry VII. the Celt was made to feel that there was a force he could not mould or bend,—a force that must either bend or break him, and would, if possible, compel him to order. Hence the Reformation appeared to the Irish simply as an arbitrary act of the power they had learned to hate. Henry VIII. called a Parliament, which passed whatever acts he wished. Most of the bishops and clergy acquiesced in the supremacy of the king; but so unpopular was the change, that O'Neill was able to raise an insurrection in Ulster to oppose it, which was vigorously suppressed. It was not, however, until 1631, that Protestantism was formally established by law. Queen Mary restored the old order, of course; but her power in Ireland was so weak, that the country gave asylum to English Protestant refugees. In 1560, after the accession of Elizabeth, a Parliament was held, in which sat three archbishops and seventeen bishops. This Parliament restored the ecclesiastical order of Henry VIII. and Edward VI., but it is not certain how many of the bishops actually conformed. The Reformation made no real progress among the people. At the beginning of the reign of James I. the condition of the established Church was deplorable. The clergy were largely illiterate, and drawn from the lowest orders, and, although often pluralists, were almost beggars; the revenues being absorbed, under corrupt agreements, by those in authority. During the reigns of Queens Mary and Elizabeth the civil history presents a succession of rebellions and ferocious internal feuds. Exhaustration brought peace, and King James I. took advantage of the desolation of Ulster to introduce Scotch settlers. These settlers were strongly opposed to prelacy, and formed a basis for the Presbyterian Church of Ireland.

Charles I. tried the ruinous policy of using Ireland as a power against his Parliament. The Protestants were systematically disarmed, and the frightful outbreak of 1641 was the result. The Parliament sent some Scotch troops to Carrickfergus, attended by chaplains; and among them, in 1642, was organized the first presbytery of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. The misery of the country for the next few years was such as can hardly be equalled, even in her dismal annals. When Cromwell came, he found five hostile armies ranged against each other, and all preying on the wretched peasantry. His sharp and decisive treatment is well known. He proceeded to parcel out the forfeited and almost depopulated lands among English settlers, mostly Baptists and Independents. For a few years Ireland enjoyed prosperity, but the policy of the Restoration undid much of the work. Cromwell's settlers were dispersed, and many of them emigrated to the New World. Up to this time it does not appear that the penal laws against Roman Catholics had been seriously enforced, although Cromwell refused liberty to celebrate the mass. The effect of Protestantism showed itself in a marked way on the Roman-Catholic clergy. From this time we hear no more of illegitimate children of bishops, nor of scandalous lives among the priests. Those who see most clearly the mischief the Roman-Catholic Church does in Ireland admit, that, with regard to purity of life, the Irish priesthood stands pre-eminent among the Roman-Catholic clergy of Europe.

When the Revolution of 1688 took place, and James II. landed in Ireland, the Protestants of Ulster large districts which had been forfeited were bestowed on owners who leased them for terms of thirty years to Scotch Presbyterian settlers.

4. From the Protestant Ascendancy to the Union of Ireland to Great Britain.—The government now fell entirely into the hands of a few great Protestant-Episcopal land-holders. The Established Church had gained no hold on the people, and Ireland became the worst governed country in Europe. During the reign of Queen Anne, penal laws which bore almost as heavily on Presbyterians as on Roman Catholics were vigorously enforced. The state of religion was deplorable. The Established Church had gained no hold on the people, and, indeed, had made no adequate effort to do so. The richer bishoprics and deaneries were occupied by men who were chosen for quite other reasons than spiritual fitness. Most of the clergy were poorly paid, and were content to perform
mechanically the duties required of them. The Roman-Catholic priests were, for the most part, very uneducated; and the penal laws were enforced with such severity, that in many places the sacraments were left unadministered. Cromwell's Baptists and Independents, who at one time were formed one-half of the Protestant population, had almost disappeared, in a way hard to account for. The Presbyterian Church presented a brighter aspect. It was felt that the strong Presbyterians were needed; and even the bigoted Irish Parliament had to provide for their admission to the army, and in 1719 passed an act of toleration in spite of the hysterical protests of the bishops.

In 1727 the Presbyterian Church was weakened by the secession of the synod of Antrim,—a body sympathizing so much with latitudinarian views as to the divinity of Christ, as to make a subscription to the Westminster standard distasteful, and still further by the emigration of her members to America. As the leases granted under William III. fell in, the landlords raised the rents, charging the tenants for their own improvements.

The enterprising Ulster farmers would not submit; and this, with the policy towards dissenters sanctioned, sent many of the race which had obtained in 1782 the independence of the Irish Church in Ireland, for eighteen years, had home rule; but, under the system of parliament, turned to the Roman Catholics, 635,670 Protestant Episcopalians, 28,503 Presbyterians, and 47,889 Methodists; forming respectively, 76.6, 12.3, 9.4, and .9 per cent of the whole population. All other religious bodies, including about 4,500 Independents (or Congregationalists), about the same number of Baptists, about 4,000 Quakers, 453 Jews, and 1,144 persons who refused information, numbered only 39,109, or .8 per cent.

The enterprising Ulster farmers would not submit; and this, with the policy towards dissenters sanctioned, sent many of the race which had obtained in 1782 the independence of the Irish Church in Ireland.

In 1829 important reforms were carried out in the administration of the Roman-Catholic Church, in particular with regard to the appointment of bishops.

In 1833 the anti-tithe demonstrations led to a reform of the Established Church, by which it was arranged that the archbishops of Cashel and Tuam, and eight bishoprics, were to be left unfilled on their becoming vacant. This measure was vigorously opposed by the bishops and clergy of the Established Church, and there were dismal prophecies of the results. The actual loss of spiritual light due to the extinction of these ecclesiastical stars was, however, less than was expected. In fact, we have entered on a period of progress and success in both the Established and Presbyterian churches.

The rest of the eighteenth century may be passed over rapidly. The penal laws with regard to the Roman Catholics were gradually relaxed. Fear of French invasion caused the arming of the volunteers. The efforts of Grattan and Flood, backed by the strength of the volunteers, obtained in 1782 the independence of the Irish Parliament. Ireland, for eighteen years, had home rule; but, under the system of parliamentary representation then in force, this meant only the tyranny of a land-holding minority. The rebellion of 1798, with its frightful outrages on both sides, took place. Pitt, then at the head of the English Government, resolved to do away with the farce of Irish independence. He was resolved on union. The Roman Catholics favored the measure as promising them some relief, and it was carried by direct bribery.

5. From the Union to the Present Time. —In the first years of the nineteenth century, the state of religion in the Protestant churches in Ireland was not much better. The Roman Catholics favored the measure as promising them some relief, and it was carried by direct bribery.

In 1829 important reforms were carried out in the administration of the Roman-Catholic Church, in particular with regard to the appointment of bishops.

In 1839 important reforms were carried out in the administration of the Roman-Catholic Church, in particular with regard to the appointment of bishops.
IRELAND.

The oldest Irish university is that of Dublin, established 1591. The Queen's University, soon to be superseded by the Royal University, has colleges in Belfast, Cork, and Galway.

In 1880 the national school system maintained 7,590 schools, having on their rolls 1,083,020 pupils. In 1841, 53 per cent of the population could neither read nor write. In 1871 this percentage was reduced to 33 for the whole country, and to 27 for Ulster.


IRELAND, John, b. at Ashburnton, Devonshire, Nov. 26, 1816. He was the author of Five Discourses: containing Certain Arguments for and against the Reception of Christianity by the Ancient Jews and Greeks, London, 1796; Nuptiae sacrae, or An Inquiry into the Scriptural Doctrine of Marriage and Divorce, London, 1821; The Plague of Marseilles in the Year 1720, London, 1834. Besides other benefactions, he left ten thousand pounds to establish at Oxford a professorship of biblical exegesis. This professorship has been held by Canon H. P. Liddon, D.D., since 1870.

IRENEUS, Bishop of Lyons (Lugdunum), one of the most distinguished authors and theologians of the early Church; was b., probably in Asia Minor, about 115; d. in Lyons about 190 (usual date 182). As the facts of his life are not certain, to a large extent, from his own writings, we will begin with a survey of the latter.

1. Writings.—The only work of Irenæus which has come down to us entire is his treatise against Gnosticism, Ἐντός ἡς καὶ ἄνωθεν τῆς φύσεως καὶ τῆς φύσιν ἐν καθολικῷ καὶ ἐν οἰκουμένῃ ("Disproof and Refutation of the Gnosis falsely so called"). It was written in Greek, but is preserved only in a Latin translation and some fragments of a Syriac version. A portion of the original Greek text has, however, been preserved by Epiphanius, who transcribed verbally the first book, to 1, 4, in his work on Heresies (vi. 31, 9-34), and quotes largely in other places without, however, mentioning the source. Hippolytus likewise drew from the Greek original of Irenæus in his Refutation of all Heresies (vi. 38, 42-52, vii. 32-
This work of Irenaeus was usually quoted by the shorter titles, πρὸς τὸν ἀρνίμην, or ἄρη πρὸς τὸν ἀρνίμην ("Against Heretics") and Adv. hereticos ("Against Heretics"). Irenaeus may have found occasion, in the prevalence of Gnostic errors in his own diocese, for composing this work, as some of the disciples of the Gnostic Marcus had come to that vicinity (i. 13, 7), and the writings of Florinus, an apostate to Valentinianism, were circulated in the congregations along the Rhone. But the primary occasion of the work was the request of a friend to be supplied with more definite information in regard to the doctrines of Valentius. See Gnosticism.

The work itself consists of five books. In the first the author gives a description of the Gnostic heresies, and in the remaining four a refutation of them by summarizing the teachings of the evangelists and the Pauline Epistles. The work shows clearness of thought, but is somewhat discursive. He makes no pretension to literary finish, or elegance of Greek diction (i. Pref.), but only pursues the one object in view. While it is his primary purpose to analyze and refute the Valentinian heresy, he takes in all heresies, inasmuch as it is only a "recapitulation of all heresies," and has its roots back in Simon Magus. He was acquainted with older treatises against heresies (v. Pref.), but draws largely upon the writings of Valentius and his personal contact with that Gnostic’s disciples. The third book (iii. 21, 1) was written while Eleutherus was bishop of Rome (175–189). The Latin translation must have been made soon after the original was written, as Tertullian, in his treatise against the Valentinians (about 202–207), speaks of Irenaeus as one of his authorities, and as the most "studious explorer of all doctrines" (omnia doctrinarum curiosissimusexplorator).

Irenaeus wrote at least two other works on the heresies, both addressed to Florinus, — ἐν γένεσι καὶ μοναρχία ἢ πρὸς τὸν ἀρνίμην ("A Letter concerning the Divine Sovereignty, or whether God is not the Creator of Evils"), and σπευδάμων ἢ πρὸς οὐράνιον ("Zeal concerning the Ogdoad "). Both these works are quoted by Eusebius. The latter is preserved in a Syriac translation. Irenaeus took an active interest in the Easter controversies of his day (see Easter), and wrote on this subject a letter to Titian, bishop of Rome, and probably his treatise addressed to the Roman Blaesus, πρὸς σκαμοὺς ("The Schism"). Eusebius (v. 28) and Jerome refer to a Book of Various Discussions, which was probably a collection of homilies; and Eusebius (v. 28), to an apologetic work (πρὸς Ἑλλάνας, etc.), probably on the rule of faith. Other works attributed to him, as a Commentary on the Canticles, are of doubtful authenticity.

2. Life. — Irenaeus spent the earlier years of his life in Asia Minor, and was probably born there early in the second century. He speaks (v. 30, 3) of the Apocalypse of John as "having been seen almost in our own generation at (or near) the close of Domitian’s reign" (96). Irenaeus’ painstaking accuracy leaves no ground for extending this period to fifty years, and putting the date of his life in 147 (as Casser) or 147 (Zingerl). These late dates are also incompatible with other positive testimonies in regard to his relations to Polycarp and other disciples of the apostles in Asia Minor; although it is doubtful whether Papias was among them, as Jerome states (Ep., 75, 3 ad Theodorus). He speaks in such a way of those “who had seen John face to face,” and “of some who had not only seen John, but others of the apostles” (ii. 22 5; v. 5, 1; 30, 1; 33, 3; 36, 2), as to leave no doubt that he had been the recipient of verbal communications from them. Polycarp suffered a martyrdom at Smyrna, Feb. 30, 155. Of his relations to him he says (iii. 3, 4), ὅτι ἡμικεὶσε ἔφορον ἐν τῷ πρῶτῳ ἤθε χώρικα ἐπιτολό χαράντος καὶ παντὸς γεραλίους, ἔνδοξος καὶ ἐπιφανεστότα μαρτύρους, etc. ("whom we also saw in our early years, for he remained a very long time, and at a great age was put to death, testifying most gloriously," etc.). The period expressed by “early years” must evidently be used in the usual sense among the Greeks, for the years of early manhood, eighteen to thirty-five, especially as Irenaeus himself reckons the thirtieth year to the “first period of life” (prima etas), and extends it to the fortieth year (ii. 22, 5). As Polycarp was about a hundred years old when he suffered martyrdom at Smyrna, he would have been an aged man in 130, when we may think of Irenaeus as having first seen him. Another evidence that Irenaeus was born about 115, and lived in or near Smyrna between 130 and 140, is his acquaintance with Florinus. He reminds Florinus, in his letter to him, of having met him in Asia Minor, in ὁμολογία with Polycarp, while he (Irenaeus) was still a boy (μαθήματος). Florinus was a court official. Lightfoot (Contemp. Rev., 1875) ventures the doubtful explanation that this does not mean that he was at the court of the then ruling emperor, but belonged to the household of Antoninus Pius, who afterwards became emperor, and was proconsul of Asia about 135. Rather must we think of one of the two visits of the Emperor Hadrian to Asia Minor, and of these the second, when he tarried for some time. Both visits occurred between 122 and 130, and the second about 129. Our assumption, then, of the year 115 as the date of Irenaeus’ birth fails in well with the description that he was still a boy (μαθήματος) at the time of his meeting with Florinus (129). The term μαθήματος ("boy"), however, is sometimes extended to an older period of life. Eusebius, for example, calls Origen a boy when he was a theological teacher, and certainly above eighteen (H. E., vi. 3, 3; 8, 1–5); and Constantine speaks of himself in the same way at the outbreak of the Diocletian persecution, when he was almost thirty (Euseb.: Vita Const., ii. 51, 1; comp. i. 19, 1).

Another evidence for the year 115 as the date of Irenaeus’ birth is the fact that he was resident in Rome as a teacher at the time of Polycarp’s death (155). The account of Polycarp’s martyrdom (Martirium Polyc.), written, at the latest, before the close of the fourth century, is our only reliable authority on this point. It draws from one of Irenaeus’ own works; and as, in other cases where it draws from Irenaeus’ great work, it is accurate, so we may expect it to be in this. This residence in Rome explains the lively interest Irenaeus afterwards took in the Roman Church, and his accurate acquaintance with its traditions, as the short sojourn in 177 scarcely can. He speaks of details of the pontificates of
Irenæus of Tyre

Irenæus, b. at Schwedtitz, Saxony, d. at Horn, Austria, at unknown dates; was appointed pastor at Eisleben in 1562, and after wards court-preacher at Weimar, but was charged and banished in 1572, as one of the noisiest champions of Flacius; emigrated to Austria, and published a pamphlet against the first article of the Formula Concilii, 1581; and another, Von Bilde Gottes, 1585.

Ireneus of Tyre represented the Emperor Theodosius II. at the Council of Ephesus, 431, and espoused the cause of Nestorius, but was, for that very reason, banished from the court; and, when the Oriental bishops made him bishop of Tyre (445), he was deposed and banished by an imperial decree. Of his Greek work on the Nestorian controversy, only some fragments of a Latin translation are extant. A translation of Irenæus is in Clark's Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Edinburgh, 1868-69, 2 vols. See two articles on Irenæus, in Bibliotheca Sacra, 1877, by Professor C. J. H. Reppen.

Irenæus of Tyre

Irenæus, b. at Schwedtitz, Saxony, d. at Horn, Austria, at unknown dates; was appointed pastor at Eisleben in 1562, and after wards court-preacher at Weimar, but was charged and banished in 1572, as one of the noisiest champions of Flacius; emigrated to Austria, and published a pamphlet against the first article of the Formula Concilii, 1581; and another, Von Bilde Gottes, 1585.

Ireneus, b. at Vienna, 1703; died at Horn, Austria, at unknown dates; was over-ruled by history to reign; and she proposed marriage to Charlemagne in order to unite the Eastern and Western empires. But, in spite of all her crimes and cruelties, she is a saint of the Greek Church; for she overthrew the iconoclasts, and re-established image-worship; which article see. At last, however, she was over-reached by her own treasurer, Nicephorus, deposed, and banished to the Isle of Lesbos, where she earned her living by spinning.

IRENICAL THEOLOGY, or IRENICS (from Iren., "peace"), presents the points of agreement among Christians with a view to the ultimate unity, if not organic union, of Christendom. It is the opposite of polemics, yet its legitimate successor, heir by divine right to its territory. It seeks to show how large is the common ground, and how comparatively unimportant are the points in dispute. In every age of the Church there have been peace-loving spirits; such as Gregory of Nazianzus and Chrysostom in the Nicene age; Melanchthon and Butzer in the sixteenth century; Calixtus, Grotius, Baxter, Dury, Spener, Zinzendorf, and Neander in later times. The union of the various denominations in Christian work proves the existence of the irenical temper, and, so far as it is the result of a recognition of the common Christianity, it is to be applauded; but there is a sort of irenics which results from indifference, and such a temper is reprehensible.

The noble sentence of Rupertus Meldenius (often falsely attributed to Augustine) — "In necessary things, unity; in unnecessary things, liberty; in all things, charity" — has probably contributed as much as any treatise to bring about brotherhood among Christians. But there is quite a sort of irenics which results from indifference, and such a temper is reprehensible.

The noble sentence of Rupertus Meldenius (often falsely attributed to Augustine) — "In necessary things, unity; in unnecessary things, liberty; in all things, charity" — has probably contributed as much as any treatise to bring about brotherhood among Christians. But there is quite a sort of irenics which results from indifference, and such a temper is reprehensible.
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Irving, Edward, an original and distinguished preacher, and the real founder of the Catholic Apostolic Church, was b. in Annan, Scotland, Aug. 4, 1792, and d. in Glasgow, Dec. 7, 1834. His father was a tanner. At the age of thirteen he went to the University of Edinburgh, and, graduating four years afterward, he took a school at Haddington, and in 1812 one at Kirkcaldy. At the former place he was the tutor of Jane Elsh. Afterwards the wife of Carlile. In 1815 he was called to the Caledonian Church, London. The audience, which was at first small, grew rapidly, until it completely filled the church. A reference to Irving’s eloquence by Canning on the floor of Parliament, is thought to have contributed to this result. Two years later a new church was built on Regent Square. Irving was a man of commanding form and stature (six feet two inches tall), with pale, meagre, but interesting face, coal-black hair reaching down to his shoulders, eyes from which he looked forth somewhat obliquely, but with an expression of severe, holy earnestness, not unmixed with self-consciousness. His utterances were pregnant with original thoughts, but florid, and adorned by the figures of a rich imagination. Walter Scott said he missed in his sermons the chastest simplicity which is the freest, brotherliest, bravest human soul mine ever came in contact with. I call him, on the whole, the best man I have ever found in this world, or hope to find.” This admiration suffered no abatement with years, and in 1867 he again took up his pen to commemorate Irving’s strong personality. He regarded his friend as having been the victim of hallucination, but passed a high tribute (as far as he could do so in his straitlum temper of mind) upon his public life. “I am the Lord’s.” Of him his friend Thomas Carlyle, a kindred nature in the originality of his mind, imposing impressiveness of personality, and strength of will, writing in 1835 said, “His was the freest, brotherliest, bravest human soul mine ever came in contact with. I call him, on the whole, the best man I have ever found in this world, or hope to find.” This admiration suffered no abatement with years, and in 1867 he again took up his pen to commemorate Irving’s strong personality. He regarded his friend as having been the victim of hallucination, but passed a high tribute (as far as he could do so in his straitlum temper of mind) upon his public life. “I am the Lord’s.” Of him his friend Thomas Carlyle, a kindred nature in the originality of his mind, imposing impressiveness of personality, and strength of will, writing in 1835 said, “His was the freest, brotherliest, bravest human soul mine ever came in contact with. I call him, on the whole, the best man I have ever found in this world, or hope to find.” This admiration suffered no abatement with years, and in 1867 he again took up his pen to commemorate Irving’s strong personality. He regarded his friend as having been the victim of hallucination, but passed a high tribute (as far as he could do so in his straitlum temper of mind) upon his public life. “I am the Lord’s.” Of him his friend Thomas Carlyle, a kindred nature in the originality of his mind, imposing impressiveness of personality, and strength of will, writing in 1835 said, “His was the freest, brotherliest, bravest human soul mine ever came in contact with. I call him, on the whole, the best man I have ever found in this world, or hope to find.” This admiration suffered no abatement with years, and in 1867 he again took up his pen to commemorate Irving’s strong personality. He regarded his friend as having been the victim of hallucination, but passed a high tribute (as far as he could do so in his straitlum temper of mind) upon his public life. “I am the Lord’s.” Of him his friend Thomas Carlyle, a kindred nature in the originality of his mind, imposing impressiveness of personality, and strength of will, writing in 1835 said, “His was the freest, brotherliest, bravest human soul mine ever came in contact with. I call him, on the whole, the best man I have ever found in this world, or hope to find.” This admira...
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ISAAC (יִשְׂאָכָא, or יִשָּׂאָכָא, “laugher”), the son of Abraham and Sarah, is a much less conspicuous and energetic personality than his father. He was an obedient servant to his father for the display of faith and obedience, in his circumcision (Gen. xxii. 4), and his willingness to offer him up as a sacrifice (Gen. xxii.). Isaac shows his dutifulness by marrying Rebekah, as Abraham wished him to do, and this when he was already forty years old. He was generous to his friends, and always yielded to his neighbors (Gen. xxvi. 20 sq.), but won the respect of more powerful chiefs, who considered it advisable to be on good terms with the “blessed of the Lord” (Gen. xxvi. 28 sq.). Isaac’s importance consists mainly in the fact that he was the link extending the blessing of the covenant from Abraham to Jacob. Two sons were born to him late in life (Gen. xxv. 21); and although he preferred the older, Esau, he was deceived into conferring the blessing upon Jacob, the younger. A feud broke out, in consequence, between the two brothers; but the death of the father, in his hundred and eighthieth year, was the occasion of their reconciliation. Isaac bowed submissively to the dispensations of Providence; and, although the weakest of the three patriarchs, he represents the pious fidelity which quietly preserves the inherited blessing. The later Jews regarded him as the prototype of the martyrs.

Josephus says that Isaac was twenty-five years old when Abraham led him into the land of Moriah, to sacrifice him. There is no other authority for this statement. But it is evident that Isaac was at least a lad, as the father placed the wood of sacrifice on his back for him to carry (Gen. xxii. 8). He was not only a dutiful son, but a constant and gentle husband, and in all his trials seems to have been a pattern of resignation and humility. Tertullian and others of the fathers, and Fairbairn and others in modern times, regard him as a type of Christ in this respect. The discussion of the sacrifice of Isaac belongs most properly under ABRAHAM; but this much may be said here: (1) The ancient idea, universally prevalent, that the son was the property of the father, pervades the whole account of the event, as Professor Mozley specially insists. (2) It was God who commanded the deed. (3) The whole circumstance was designed to try and to strengthen the faith of Abraham. (4) It was a vivid object-lesson, warning the Hebrews for all future time against human sacrifices.

LIT. — BICKELL: Ausgewählte Gedichte d. syrischen Kirchenwrters, Kempten, 1872; and Isaac Antiocheni Opera Omnia, edited G. Bickell, Giessen, 1870, and by the Syriac and Arabian manuscripts.

ISAAC LEVITAI b. at Wetzlar 1515; studied rabbinical lore, and filled for several years the office of a rabbi, but was by the study of the Messianic prophecies led to embrace Christianity; assumed the name of Johann Isaac Levi; and was appointed professor of Hebrew and Chaldee languages at Louvain 1546, and at Cologne 1551. He wrote several works on Hebrew grammar, which were much valued in their time, also a defence of the trustworthiness of the Old Testament: Defensio Veritatis H. Sac. Script., Cologne, 1559.

ISA’IHAH (יוֹשֵׁיָה, or יֵשֵׁיָהוֹ) was the greatest of the Hebrew prophets. His name has been derived from יֵשֵׁיָה (in which case it means “Salvation of Jehovah”). But I prefer the derivation from מַעֲשֵׁי ("to look"), and the pronunciation יֵשֵׁי ("Yishayahu"), or יֵשַׁיָה ("Yishaya"). There are only two mentions of Isaiah in the Bible outside of the prophecy itself and 2 Kings xviii. sqq. In 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22 it is said, “The rest of the acts of Uzziah did Isaiah the son of Amoz write.” This may refer to a special work of Isaiah not preserved, or to a portion of the Book of the Kings, or to the first six chapters of the prophecy. It has afforded ground for some to contend that the first five chapters date, in whole or in part, from the early years of Uzziah’s reign. But it is evident that nothing definite can be

thodox,” and one “a Chalcedonian heretic;” namely (I.) Isaac of Amid, who was a pupil of Epaphraem Syrus, and went to Rome during the reign of Arpadus, to see the Capitol, but was imprisoned for a long time in Constantinople, while on his return; (II.) Isaac of Edessa, who in the reign of the Emperor Zeno, and during the patriarchate of Petrus Fullo, came to Antioch, and preached against the Nestorians, deriving his text from a parrot which could screech the Trisagion with the addition, δὲ σαρκωσὲς καὶ φωνάζει; and another (III.) Isaac of Euseba, who was orthodox in the time of Bishop Paul (612), but a Nestorian in the time of Bishop Asclepius (522).

Gennadius knows two Syriac church-writers of the name Isaac. The latter of them he calls a “presbyter of the Church of Antioch,” and ascribes to him a very long life, during which he wrote much in Syriac, and finally, during the reign of Leo and Majoranus, a great elegic poem lamenting the destruction of Antioch (498). Bickell identifies the two first Israels of Jacob of Edessa with the second Isaac of Gennadius, and considers him to be orthodox; though his sermons contain no direct recognition of the synod of Chalcedon, but, on the contrary, a number of passages of rank Monophysitism, which Bickell can explain away only by assuming very large interpolations. One point, however, may be considered as settled: the book De contemplu mundi (Magna Bibl., VI., 2, 688, Col. 1618; Lugd.-XII. 1019; Gallandi XII. 2) does not belong to Isaac of Antioch, but to Isaac Ninivia, who lived a century later on, and to whom it is ascribed both by the Greek edition of Nicephorus Theotokius, Leipzig, 1770, and by the Syriac and Arabian manuscripts.

LIT. — BICKELL: Ausgewählte Gedichte d. syrischen Kirchenwrters, Kempten, 1872; and Isaac Antiocheni Opera Omnia, edited G. Bickell, Giessen, 1870, and by the Syriac and Arabian manuscripts.

ISA’IHAH (יוֹשֵׁיָה, or יֵשֵׁיָהוֹ) was the greatest of the Hebrew prophets. His name has been derived from יֵשֵׁי (in which case it means “Salvation of Jehovah”). But I prefer the derivation from מַעֲשֵׁי ("to look"), and the pronunciation יֵשֵׁי ("Yishayahu"), or יֵשַׁיָה ("Yishaya"). There are only two mentions of Isaiah in the Bible outside of the prophecy itself and 2 Kings xviii. sqq. In 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22 it is said, “The rest of the acts of Uzziah did Isaiah the son of Amoz write.” This may refer to a special work of Isaiah not preserved, or to a portion of the Book of the Kings, or to the first six chapters of the prophecy. It has afforded ground for some to contend that the first five chapters date, in whole or in part, from the early years of Uzziah’s reign. But it is evident that nothing definite can be
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drawn from the words. The second notice (2 Chron. xxxii. 32) reads, “The rest of the acts of Hezekiah . . . are written in the vision of Isaiah,” etc. This undoubtedly refers to the prophecy of Isaiah, which is called the “vision of Isaiah” (i. 1). But from very ancient times many have found here a trace of another work of Isaiah. An attempt to imitate or to restore such a work has come down to us in the so-called Vision of Isaiah, which is combined with an account of the prophet’s martyrdom. This work was cited by Origen, and has been edited from Ethiopic manuscripts by Laurence (1819) and Dillmann (1872), under the title Ascensus Isaaci. A Christian was undoubtedly its author (Dillmann); but the matter was a subject of Jewish tradition, and we meet with it in other places. It states that Isaiah suffered a violent death in the reign of Manasseh, being sown asunder with a wooden saw (see Justin Mart. Tryph. ed. Otto, p. 490), after an iron one had been tried in vain (see v. Gebhardt’s edition of the Greek account of the martyrdom in Hilgenfeld’s Zeitschr., 1878, p. 341). Origen says the condemnation was based upon the prophet’s blasphemous utterances concerning God and Jerusalem (iii. 6–12). The Gemara also says that Manasseh put Isaiah to death, but goes on to narrate that he was encompassed by a cedar, which they sawed through until Isaiah’s blood flowed out like water (see also Targum in Cod. Reuchlin, at Isa. lxvi. 1). The Roman Church celebrates his martyrdom July 6; the Greek, May 8. One fact, at least, may with certainty be derived from these traditions: namely, that Isaiah died in the reign of Manasseh. Combining this fact with the statement that Isaiah prophesied “in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah” (i. 1), we conclude that his public life began some time in Uzziah’s reign, and extended into that of Manasseh. More definitely (according to vi. 1) it began in the fifty-second year of Uzziah’s reign, which was the year of his death. Uzziah died 758 B.C.; and, if we suppose that Isaiah was twenty years old at that time, he would have been eighty-one at the beginning of Manasseh’s reign (686 B.C.); so that it is not necessary at all to assume that Isaiah lived to an unusually great age.

These years of Isaiah’s prophetic activity (758–690 B.C.) were years of the most varied events and decisive changes. Here belong the protracted attempts of the Assyrians kings to become masters of Palestine and Syria. In the realization of this design they were hampered by the Medes and the repeated attempts of the Babylonians to throw off the Assyrian yoke, as well as by the Egyptians, whose foreign policy had begun to be aggressive. The Jews of Jerusalem were kept in the air, and reduced to their own experiences and the events narrated in his prophecy. He was a citizen of Jerusalem, had at least two sons (vii. 3, viii. 1), treated his wife and children as living pictures, and emblems of what he announced, and looked back to the vision of vi. 1 as the turning-point of his thought and life, which made it possible for him to stand firm, without distrust or fear, where all was unstable and dark (viii. 11 sqq.). He regarded it as his duty to train up a body of disciples to retain their trust in God, but with resignation looked forward to the destruction of Jerusalem as an unavoidable event, and counselled unreserved submission to the Assyrian power. It becomes a matter of no surprise that a prophet who identified himself so closely with public affairs should have gathered about him a body of disciples. For these disciples, as well as for future generations, he wrote down his utterances; and there can be no doubt that he wrote much. The only question that arises is, whether the book which goes by his name has come down in its original form. In the consideration of this question, it will help us little to trace out evidences of the style and spirit of Isaiah in different parts of the book (for what was written in the age of the prophet is something different from what was written in the age of the editors), but to fall back on certain prepossession of what God is able to reveal through prophecy concerning the future.

All historical investigation about the authenticity of the prophecy must start from the account of Isaiah in chap. xxxvi. xxxix. It was placed
by the editor between two series of anonymous prophecies, of which the preceding one relates the transformation of the Assyrian, and the succeeding one the transformation of the Babylonian, expression into salvation for Judah. It is unscholarly and arbitrary to make a break at the end of chap. xxxv. and at chap. xxxix., as though one had reached, in chap. xl., the coast of an unknown land. These portions all belong together. He who has read chap. xxxv. finds nothing strange in xl. 1, and only he who has read chap. xxxvii.—xxxix. understands xlvii. 8–11, and appreciates that one and the same prophet (xlvii. 10) distinguishes two periods in his prophetic activity, whose utterances run along parallel lines, and who, on the basis of their fulfilment in the first period, can demand obedience in the second. He who consents to recognize chaps. xxxviii.—xxxv., as a whole, as Isaiah's, has no scientific ground for denying that chaps. xl.—lxvi. are essentially his also. The main difficulties have been, that Cyrus is predicted by name, the overthrow of the Babylonian power, and the liberation of the Jews. But if the description of the servant of Jehovah, which suits Jesus of Nazareth best, was fulfilled, why not the prediction concerning Cyrus? The freer from prejudices the student is, the more certainly will he conclude that chaps. xl.—lxvi. contain prophecies of Isaiah, although arranged in their present form by another hand than his.

In the narrative of chaps. xxxvi.—xxxix. we learn, that from the thirteenth year of Hezekiah's reign, until after Sennacherib's campaign, Isaiah stood in high esteem at court, and his word was accepted as authority. In the six prophecies of chaps. xxxviii.—xxxv., the author takes the same position that the author of chaps. xxxvi.—xxxix. does concerning the invasion of Sennacherib. Chaps. xxxiv. and xxxv. have been denied to Isaiah, and been referred to the time of the exile; but this certainly would never have been done if the wildness (xxxv.) had not been arbitrarily explained to be the wildness lying between Babylon and Judah, and the Book of Jehovah (xxxv. 10) been explained to be the Book of Isaiah.

The other two portions of Isaiah (ii.—xii. and xiii.—xxvii.) bear Isaiah's name. Here we find many parallels with chaps. xxviii.—xxxix. (comp. ii. 20 with xxxv. 22, iii. 8–iv. 1 with xxxii. 1–20, etc.), but the plan of chaps. ii.—xii. agrees remarkably with the plan of chaps. xxviii.—xxxix. We may, it seems to me, confidently assert that all of this section belongs to Isaiah, although parts of it (v.—xii.) may not be preserved in the order in which they belong. The prophet's utterances of the second portion (xiii.—xxvii.) are distinguished by being the expression of the mind immediately under the influence of its ecstatic emotion. In the first part, the ruling thought is the preservation of David's throne and city by Jehovah, and their restoration to a position of glorious prosperity. In the second part, the ruling thought is the universal kingdom of Jehovah and glory out of his judgments upon the peoples, and the humiliation of all human greatness. The whole consists of prophecies of Isaiah with older fragments.


**KLOSTERMANN.**

ISH'BOSHETH (יהלא) ("man of shame") was that son of Saul who survived the ruin of his father's family in the battle of Gilboa. His real name was Ish-baal (1 Chron. ix. 39), which a later generation gave up in order to avoid the use of the name Baal. Abner, Saul's captain, espoused the claims of Ishboseth after the death of his father and three brothers, and he was proclaimed king of the trans-Jordanic tribes and all Israel, the house of Judah alone remaining true to David (2 Sam. iii. 8–10). He was about forty years old at the time. He was a timid man, and depended very largely upon Abner. The latter was called to account for his intimate relations with the king's concubine, Rizpah, but in turn reproached the king for his ingratitude, and declared he would espose the cause of David. Ishboseth gave vent to his anger, and refused to go to Abner, his request. Abner now plotted to deliver up the northern tribes to David, but was murdered by Joab (2 Sam. iii. 2–39). Ishboseth himself was murdered by two of his officers. They cut off his head, and carried it to David. But David
gave it honorable burial, and put the assassins to death (2 Sam. iv. 1—12).

H. GUTHER.

ISHMAEL (יהושָׁעָל, "God hears") was the son of Abraham and Hagar (an Egyptian slave). He was circumcised at the age of thirteen (Gen. xvii. 25), but was sent away with his mother, reluctantly, by Abraham, to satisfy Sarah, who had become jealous of the playful (wrongly translated mocking) lad (Gen. xxii. 9). The rabbins falsely explained the word, of malicious bantering treatment of Isaac. In the desert of Beersheba, Hagar received a revelation, when she and her son seemed to be destined to die for want of water. The narrative (Gen. xxi. 9 sqq.), which reluctantly, by Abraham, to satisfy Sarah, who had become jealous of the playful (wrongly trans falsely explained the word, of malicious bantering him as their ancestor (xxv. 12—18). The general character of these descendants was indicated in the words spoken of Ishmael: "He will be a man like a wild ass, his hand against every man, and every man against him" (xiv. 12). This is a masterly characterization, to which the wandering life of those tribes, shunning every place of civilization, accurately corresponds. They have ever since lived by their flocks and their bow, in the use of which they became skilful, like their ancestors (Gen. xxi. 20; Isa. xxi. 17). They inhabited the desert east of Palestine, and stretched in a southerly direction to the Persian Gulf and over Northern Arabia. The Moslem Arabs, who speak with pride of their descent from Ishmael, say that he and his mother, Hagar, lie buried in the Caaba at Mecca. V. ORELL.

ISIDORE MERCATOR, a fictitious person, a man of learning, put into circulation by his pupil, Ildefonsus of Toledo; and all the works enumerated in these lists are still extant. The principal ones are: Oficiorum Libri iv., a compendium of natural philosoph, specially that by Faustinus Arevalus, Rome, 1797—1803. W. MÖLLER.

ISIDORE OF SEVILLE (Isidorus Hispanensis, also called Isidorus Junior, in contradistinction to Isidore of Cordova), b. 560, at Carthagena, or Seville; d. in the latter city April 4, 636; descended from a noble Roman (not Gothic) family, and was, after the early death of his parents, educated by his elder brother, Leander, Bishop of Seville, whom he succeeded in 600. For thirty-six years he governed his diocese with unflagging vigor and great dignity, presided over the synods of Seville (619) and Toledo (636), founded several institutions for the better education of the clergy, and exercised a lasting influence on Spanish legislation, civil as well as ecclesiastical. But it was as an author that he achieved his greatest fame. He wrote on nearly every branch of science then known; and, though his books are distinguished by industry and learning rather than by genius and originality, they are far from being mere compilations, and in the dark ages they were almost the only light shining. We have two old lists of his works,—one by his friend and colleague, Bishop Braulio of Saragossa; and another by his pupil, Ife tonous of Toledo; and all the works enumerated in these lists are still extant. The principal ones are: Officiorum Libri iv., a kind of ecclesiastical archreopedia, the first book treating of the institutions and their working-materials, the second of the officers and their functions, the whole dedicated to his younger brother Fulgentius, Bishop of Astigi; De Natura Rerum, a compendium of natural philosophy, specially edited by G. Becker, Berlin, 1857; Sententiarum sive de Summo Bono Libri III., his most important theological work, the first book treating of dogmatics, the two last of ethics; De Viris Illustribus, a continuation of Jerome and Gennadius, containing biographies of forty-six authors,—fourteen Spaniards between Hosius of Cordova and his own time, and thirty-two foreigners between Pope Xystus and Gregory the Great; Etymologiae sive Origines, his most famous work, a kind of theological encyclopedia, and still of great value. Besides the works mentioned in the above lists, several of his letters have come down to us, and there circulate under his name a large number of spurious works, even poems; thus the so-called Isidorian Decretals have no connection whatever with him. The best collected edition of his works is that by Faustinus Arevalus, Rome, 1707—1803.
ISRAEL.

Biblical History of. Israel's history commences with the call of Abraham, who, as the rock whence Israel was hewn (Isa. li. 1), was not only at the head of the people of the old covenant, but also of the people of the new covenant in consequence of the organic connection (Gal. iii. 29). Whilst the nations of the earth went their own ways, in which they developed their natural characteristics, in the seed of Abraham a people were to be raised, which, in their particular formation, were to be, not the result of natural development, but the product of the creative power and grace of God (Deut. xxxii. 6); thus not only forming a contrast to the nations of the world, but also containing the germ of removing this contrast, since all nations of the earth were to be blessed in the seed of Abraham (Gen. xiii. 16). The character and future of the people of God are depicted in the life of his patriarchs and in the promises given to them by God, who calls himself the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob (Gen. xii. 2-7, xiii. 15 sq., xv. 5, xvii. 6 sq., xviii. 15 sq., xix. 17, xxvi. 2 sq., xxviii. 14, xxix. 11 sq.; Exod. iii. 6, 15). The patriarchal period closes with the migration of Jacob and his family into Egypt, where Israel was to become a people. Here, it seems, the people were ruled by elders and other officers, who, again, were under Egyptian masters. The great mass was given to idolatry (Josh. xxiv. 14; Ezek. xx. 7 sq., xxiii. 3, 8, 19); and the remembrance of the God of the fathers, and of the promises given to them, had to be revived first in the people. The deliverance of Israel is narrated in Exodus. To stop the rapid increase of the people, heavy tasks were laid upon them by the Egyptians. At last a royal edict was issued to kill all newly-born male children. At the point of this deepest humiliation, when the people were like a helpless child cast out in the open field, and polluted in its own blood (Ezek. vi. 5, 6), the promise given to the fathers was to be inaugurated, and El-Shaddai was to be revealed as Jehovah. Moses is born, and raised up as a deliverer of the people. In the ten plagues the battle of the living God with the national deities is victoriously fought (Exod. xii. 12; Num. xxxiiii. 4), thus foreshadowing the triumph of the kingdom of God over heathenism (Exod. xv. 11, xiv. 11). Moses leads the people, who were not yet ready for the battle with the nations of Canaan, not by the way of the land of the Philistines to Canaan (Exod. xiii. 17), but through the desert of the Sinaitic peninsula. Here they are persecuted by the Egyptians. The people are told to go on. A heavy cloud drives the water back; the noise of the elements is led by its God like a flock (Ps. lxxvi. 16-20; Isa. lxiii. 11) through the Red Sea; but the Egyptians were buried by the water. “And the people feared the Lord, and believed the Lord and his servant Moses” (Exod. xiv. 31). To prepare the people for their theocratic calling, they had to remain in the desert (Deut. vii. 2-5, 14-18). The law was given by which the tribes of Israel became a holy communion, and thus “he was king in Jeshurun” (Deut. xxxiii. 5). The sacrifice of the covenant sealed the entrance of the people into a covenant relationship with the holy God. The manner in which the covenant of the law is made shows both the electing love of that God who here enters into a covenant with his people (Ezek. vii. 8), and the holy seal of the Holy One of Israel and of his law (Amos iii. 2). As for grace and judgment, Israel is now the privileged people. By means of the covenant Jehovah was to dwell among his people. But, before the laws concerning the building of the sanctuary were given, the people, in the absence of Moses, make a calf, and break the covenant. Moses causeth the tribes of Israel to be scattered into a tribe of Levi showing especial zeal for the honor of Jehovah. Moses intercedes for the people, till at last pardon is granted. The first breaking of the covenant leads to the new revelation of Jehovah as the merciful and gracious (Exod. xxxiv. 6). During the first year's residence at Sinai, the tabernacle is erected and dedicated, and such laws were given as would distinguish the people from the Egyptians and the Canaanitish tribes (Lev. xviii. 3 sq., xx. 23 sq.). A census is then taken; and the encampment is ordered, and regulations about the tribe of Levi are made. In the second year, on the 20th of the second month, the journey from the wilderness of Sinai to the wilderness of Paran began. Moses sends spies to Canaan. Their evil report causes a general murmuring (Num. xiv. 1 sq.). As a punishment, the people had now to remain forty years in the wilderness, where Moses also died, after having appointed Joshua his successor. Joshua, by divine direction, waged a successful war against the inhabitants of the promised land, and distributed the conquered territory among the tribes of Israel. The people are warned, that, by transgressing the law of God, the same punishment will be inflicted upon them as was meted out to the Canaanites (Deut. vii. 19 sq.; Josh. xxxii. 15 sq.). After the death of Joshua, the people were ruled by the so-called “Shekhetem” or judges. During this period, the Israelites were steeped in idolatry, for which they were punished; though, on their repentance, they were always re-instated in the divine favor through the judges whom God raised up for them. Towards the end of the so-called “time of the judges,” the temporal and spiritual supreme power seems to have resided in the high priest Eli, at Shiloh; but his administration was sullied by such sins, that God allowed the Philistines to be victorious over his people, and even to capture the holy ark (1 Sam. iv.). The loss of this great national treasure seems to have at last awakened throughout all the tribes the consciousness of their forming one nation; and when, at last, the ark was recovered, Samuel, who had succeeded Eli as the high priest and judge, obtained a hold upon the nation which seemed to have recognized his authority. In Samuel's time the tribes renewed their wish, formerly expressed to Gideon (Judg. viii. 22 sq.), for a king. Samuel yielded to the request in such a manner, that
the theocratic principle was preserved; the Lord being now, as before, the real king of the people, while the king as his anointed was subject to him. Saul, who, to an extent, endeavored to emancipate the kingdom from the prophetic superintendence, and hence from the subjection under the theocratic principle, succumbs in this endeavor. David, being fully alive to the idea of a theocratic king, gave his nation a capital and a religious centre — Jerusalem, the city of God (Ps. lxi. 4), the city of the great King (Ps. xlviii. 2), which, with her mountains round about, was in itself a symbol of the divine kingdom (Ps. cxxv. 2 sq.). The institutions of the theocracy were especially developed by David by his instituting the order of the Levites and priests. As David was a type of the theocratic kingdom, he was also destined to be its bearer by means of the divine promise given to him by the prophet Nathan, according to 2 Sam. vii., which forms one of the most important turning-points in the history of the theocracy. David was succeeded by Solomon, who was destined to build the temple, from which the knowledge of the true God was to go to all nations (1 Kings viii. 41). After the death of Solomon, the decline of the Jewish nation begins. Under Rehoboam, Solomon's successor, ten tribes revolted, leaving him but Judah and Benjamin to reign over, whilst Jeroboam became king over the ten tribes. The history of the ten tribes, the kingdom of Israel, or, as it is called according to its main tribe, the kingdom of Ephraim, forms, from a theocratic standpoint, the history of a continual apostasy from Jehovah, until at last, notwithstanding all means to save it, "the sinful kingdom" (Amos ix. 8) is given to destruction, and, after an existence of two hundred years, the people are carried away as captives in 722 B.C. During these two hundred years, there reigned in Israel nineteen kings, belonging to nine different houses. The last king was Hosea, who after Samaria, "the crown of pride, the drunkards of Ephraim," was trodden under foot (Isa. xxxviii. 9), was carried away with his people by Shalmaneser.

Different was the history of the kingdom of Judah, which, although smaller, was more powerful, because it was in the possession of the true sanctuary with its priests and Levites, and because its kings belonged to the royal lineage of David, which was hallowed by the memory of the glorious ancestor David, and the promise given to his posterity. Thus it happened, that of the nineteen kings who reigned during three hundred and eighty-seven years (from the time of Rehoboam to the downfall of the kingdom), there were only nine or ten who lived in whole heartedness in what idea of a theocratic kingdom was alive. Such were Asa, Jehoshaphat, Joash, Josiah, Hezekiah, who revived the religious state of the people. In the end, however, the people of Judah, too, had to submit to the divine punishment for their many haughtiness, and to go into captivity to Babylon (588 B.C.).

In Babylon the people enjoyed the guidance of the prophets Ezekiel and Daniel; and the pious among them never resigned the hope of regaining their country, as predicted by Jeremiah (1). For this future, Israel was to be preserved in the exile. In accordance herewith, we see the people settled in Babylon, forming, as it were, a nation within a nation, and not in the least amalgamating with their Gentile neighbors. After the overthrow of the Babylonian Empire by the Persians, Cyrus permitted the Jews (538 B.C.) to return to their own land, and to rebuild Jerusalem and the temple (2 Chron. xxxvi. 22 sq.; Ez. i. 1 sq.). The return from Babylon took place under the guidance of Zerubbabel, of the house of David, and Joshua the high priest. A second colony followed under Ezra, who with Nehemiah restored the law, and constituted the Jews into a compact religious community. Under them the sacred books of the Old Testament were collected, and such reforms were introduced as to make the Jews again a people of God. In the twelfth year of his administration, Nehemiah returned to the Persian court (433 B.C.). During his absence of many years, affairs fell into disorder; but on his return, after a long residence in Persia, Nehemiah reformed all these disorders, and even expelled a grandson of the high priest, Eliashib, on account of his unlawful marriage with the daughter of Sanballat (Neh. xiii. 28). This expelled priest is undoubtedly one and the same person with Manasseh, who built a rival temple on the mountain of Gerizim. Before or during the second absence of Nehemiah, the prophet Malachi lived and labored.

From the administration of Nehemiah to the time of Alexander the Great, one atrocious crime, committed in the family of the high priest, appears as the only memorable transaction in the uneventful annals of Judea. Eliashib was succeeded in the high priesthood by Judas; Judas, by John. The latter, jealous of the influence of his brother Jesus with Bagos, the Persian governor, and suspecting him of designs on the high priesthood, murdered him within the precincts of the sanctuary. The Persian came in great indignation to Jerusalem; and, when the Jews would have prevented his entrance into the temple, he exclaimed, "Am I not purer than the one who has been murdered in the temple?" Bagos laid a heavy mulct on the people,—fifty drachms for every lamb offered in daily sacrifice.

At length the peace of this favored district was interrupted by the invasion of Alexander. While he was at the siege of Tyre, he sent to demand the surrender of Jerusalem. The high priest answered that he had sworn fealty to Darius, and was bound to maintain his allegiance to that monarch. After the taking of Gaza, the conqueror advanced against Jerusalem, and was met by the high priest Jaddua, himself clad in his pontifical robes, the priests in their ceremonial attire, the people in white garments. No sooner had Alexander beheld the high priest, than he was reminded of a vision he once had, and in which he saw a figure, in that very dress, exhorting him to pass over into Asia, and achieve the conquest of Persia. Alexander even worshipped the God of the Jews, entered the court and offered a sacrifice in the temple, whilst the high priest communicated the prophecies of Daniel concern-
ing the Greeks. Whatever truth there is in that story, certain it is, that the Jews enjoyed great liberty and privileges. Palestine now became subject to the Macedonian rule. On the death of Alexander, Judaea came into the possession of Laomedon. After the defeat of Laomedon (B.C. 320), Ptolemy, the king of Egypt, attempted to seize the whole of Syria. He advanced against Jerusalem on the march, carried a great many Jews away as captives, whom he settled in Egypt. Under the Ptolemies, the Jews enjoyed great liberties and prosperity. In the time of Antiochus the Great (223-157), Palestine was again the seat of war between Syria and Egypt, till at last, under Seleucus IV. (187-176), it came under the Syrian sway.

The plan of Alexander, to imbue the nations of the East with Greek culture, was continued under his successors, and by degrees Greekian influence was felt in Palestine. Thus Antigonus of Socho, the son of Laomedon, has a Greek name, and is said to have been a student of Greek literature. In opposition to these Hellenists, whose Judaism was of a very lax nature, there developed itself, in a quiet manner, the party of the pious, or Chasidim, which rigidly adhered to the laws of the fathers, and openly showed itself afterwards in the struggle of the Maccabees. Under Seleucus IV., as has been stated, the Jews had come under the Syrian sway. The people were governed by the high priest, and thus their condition was tolerable. When, however, the effort was made to hasten the Hellenizing the people, and to destroy altogether the Jewish nationality, new troubles began, which resulted in the rise of the Maccabees. Seleucus was succeeded by Antiochus (IV.) Epiphanes (175-164 B.C.). When he ascended the throne, there were at Jerusalem two parties—a national one, adhering to the laws of the fathers; and the Greek, which endeavored to introduce Greek manners, vices, and idolatry. Joshua, or Jason, the brother of Onias III., the high priest, by the offer of four hundred and forty talents annually as tribute, and a hundred and fifty more for permission to build a gymnasium, obtained the priesthood from Antiochus, who deposed Onias (2 Macc. iv. 7-10). Now the Greek party made rapid progress in Judæa. But Jason soon lost his high office. Menelaus, another devotee of the new ideas, simply offered Antiochus a higher tribute than Jason was paying, and got the office. The latter, however, did not leave him long in peace. While the king was absent on his second expedition against Egypt (170 B.C.), he took possession of Jerusalem for a time, with his retainers, and compelled his rival to flee to the citadel. Antiochus, professing to look upon this act of Jason as a rebellion on the part of his Jewish subjects, on his return took fearful vengeance on temple and people (1 Macc. i. 10-28; 2 Macc. v. 11-23; comp. Dan. xi. 28). In the year 168 a royal edict was issued, according to which the exercise of the Jewish religion and circumcision was interdicted, and the temple at Jerusalem was converted into one to Jupiter Olympus (1 Macc. i. 48 sq.; 2 Macc. vi. 1 sq.; Dan. xi. 30). At last the patience of the people was exhausted, and gave rise to the Maccabean struggle, which ended in the independence of Judæa. The Maccabean successors of Judas united in their own persons the offices of king and high priest (1 Macc. xiv. 28 sq.); but, though they provided able defenders of the country against foreign enemies, they could not prevent Palestine from being torn by interior factions. At that time the two religious factions known as Pharisees and Sadducees stood in opposition to each other. Hitherto the Maccabees had sided with the Pharisees; but the third successor of Judas Maccabæus, John Hyrcanus, being offended by the Pharisees, broke with them, and prepared great troubles for his descendants. His eldest son's (Aristobulus) reign was but short; but, when his second son (Alexander Janneus), ascended the throne, he was so annoyed by the popular party of the Pharisees, that, before his death, he felt obliged to advise his wife Alexandra to join the Pharisees, and abandon the Sadducees entirely. Through this policy, peace was restored, and Hyrcanus II. was made high priest while Alexandra occupied the throne. After Alexander's death (70 B.C.), a deadly strife began between the two sons (Hyrcanus and Aristobulus) for the sovereignty. In the course of this struggle both parties appealed to Pompey, who at once invaded Palestine, and, after having taken Jerusalem and its temple, appointed Hyrcanus high priest, limiting his dominion, however, to Judæa alone, and taking his brother Aristobulus, with his two sons, as captives to Rome. Alexander, one of the sons of Aristobulus, managed to escape, and tried to raise the standard of revolt against Hyrcanus, but with no success. Hyrcanus was recognized as high priest; and Antipater, for services rendered to Julius Caesar, was appointed procurator over Judæa. Caesar also granted the Jews many privileges, and at his death they were among the first to mourn for him (Suetonius: Caesar, c. 84.). Antipater made his son Phasael governor of Jerusalem, while he placed his son Herod over Galilee. The latter soon succeeded, by the help of the Romans, in becoming king of the Jews (39 B.C.). Under him Aristobulus, the last of the Maccabees, acted as high priest; but he was put to death. Herod was succeeded by his son Antipas, who, after a few years' reign, was deposed (6 A.D.), and Judæa became part of a Roman province with Syria, but with its own procurator residing at Cesarea. When Quirinius took the census, he succeeded in quelling a general revolt; but the fiercer spirits found a leader in Judas the Galilean, who, fighting for the theocratic principle (according to the notions of the Pharisees) against the Roman yoke, kindled a fire in the people, which, though often quenched, was not extinguished. Side by side with the deeds of God, who now sent to his people the promised Messiah to build up the messianic state, we now see, as if caricaturing God's word and promise, a wild, demagogical power, which leads the people, after having rejected the invitation of the Good Shepherd, to utter destruction. In quick succession the Roman governors follow each other. In quicker succession followed the high priests, with the exception of Caiaphas, who retained his office during the long reign of Pontius Pilate (26-36 A.D.). The principle of interfering as little as possible with the religious liberty of the Jews was rudely assailed by the Emperor Caligula, who gave orders that his image should be set up.
in the temple of Jerusalem, as in others else where. It was the entrance and tact of the Syrian governor Petronius, that the execution of these orders was temporarily postponed until the emperor was induced by Agrippa I. to withdraw them. Caligula soon afterwards died; and under the rule of Agrippa I., to whom the government of the entire kingdom of his grandson was intrusted, the Jews enjoyed much prosperity. In every respect the king was all they could wish. At the time of his death (in 44 A.D.: compare also Acts xii. 23), his son Agrippa being too young, Judea was again ruled by Roman governors; viz., Cuspius Fadus (from 44, under whom Thaumus played his part; Joseph., Ant. XX. 5, 1), Tiberius Alexander (the nephew of Philo, till 48?), Cumanus (48-52), and Felix (52-60). Felix, followed by Festus (60-63). At the death of the latter, the high priest Ananus, a cruel Sadducee, caused the death of James the Just, and of other massacres in the streets of Jerusalem and Cæsarea were of frequent occurrence, and massacre followed upon massacre, until Cestius Gallus, the prefect of Syria, moved his troops towards Jerusalem. In Jerusalem a war party, called "Zealots," prepared for the defence of the temple. The peace party tried in vain to pacify the insurgents, and in vain also were all attempts at peacemaking on the part of Agrippa II. Jerusalem was at open war with the Emperor Nero, who sent the first general of the empire, Vespasian, to subjugate Palestine. Into all parts of Palestine prominent men were sent to manage the affairs; and thus Josephus, the Jewish historian, was intrusted with the defence of Galilee. While Galilee and other provinces fell into the hands of Vespasian, Jerusalem awaited the enemy, but not with the whole united strength, but torn up into three factions, under John of Gischala, Eleazar, and Simon, son of Gioras. At length, however, Vespasian, who in the mean time had become emperor, sent his troops to reduce Jerusalem. Titus besieged Jerusalem, took the temple, and burned it to the ground August 10, 70 A.D.). The history of the events connected in the History of the Jews and Neighboring Nations, London, 1716-18, 2 vols. [new edition by Wheeler, London, 1865]; Ewald: Gesch. des Volkes Israel, Göttingen, 3d ed., 1864-68, 7 vols. [English translation, London, 1871 sq.]; Kurz: Gesch. d. alten Bundes, Berlin, 1853-55, 2 vols. [English translation, Edinburgh, 1880]; Weber und Holtzmann: Geschichte des Volkes Israel, Leipzig, 1867, 2 vols.; F. Hitzig: Gesch. d. Volkes Israel von Anbeginn bis zur Erob rung Masada 72 A.D., Leipzig, 1869, 2 parts; Kuenen: De Godsdienst van Israël, Leiden, 1869-70 [English translation, The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State, London, 1874-76, 3 vols.]; Hengstenberg: Gesch. des Reiches Gottes unter dem alten Bund, Leipzig, 1869-71, 3 vols. [English translation, History of the Kingdom of God under the Old Covenant, Edinburgh, 1872, 2 vols.]; Milman: History of the Jews, London, 1820-30, 3 vols.; Stanley: Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church, New York, 1874-77, 8 vols.; Wellhausen: Geschichte Israels, Berlin, 1878, 1 Bd.; W. R. Smith: Old Testament in the Jewish Church, New York, 1881; the same: The Prophets of Israel, 1882; Wellhausen's art. Israel, in Encyclopedia Britannica, vol. XIII., 1882; M. Verne's art. Israel, in Lichtenberger's Encyclopädie der Sciences Religieuses; F. W. Schultz: Die Geschichte Israels, in Zöckler's Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften, vol. i. p. 298 sq., Nordlingen, 1882. — By Jews. Jost: Gesch. d. Juden seit der Zeit der Makkabäer bis auf unsere Tage, Berlin, 1820 sq., 9 vols.; by the same: Gesch. d. Julidenthum u. seiner Secten, Berlin, 1857-59, 8 vols.; Grätz: Geschichte der Israeliten, Berlin, 1854 sq., 11 vols.; Geiger: Das Judenthum u. seine Secten, 2 vols. parts, 1864; L. Sinecke: Geschichte d. V. I., Göttingen, 1st vol., 1876; Bäck: Gesch. des jüdischen Volkes u. seiner Literatur, Lipsa, 1875. — For the New-Testament Period. Hausrath: Neuzeitliche Zeitschriften, Heidelberg, 1898 ff.; Wellhausen: Geschichte Israels, 2d ed., 1873-77; Schuchardt: Handbuch der neuetestamentlichen Zeitschriften, Leipzig, 1875. [See also Derenbourg: Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine, Paris, 1867; J. H.
of the destruction of Jerusalem, Israel, or the Jews in the Diaspora. The ruins of the city and the temple, the seat of the college of learning, and Gamaliel II. was chosen its spiritual head. The religious life of the Jews was re-organized, and the decisions of Jamnia were carried to the Jews of the Diaspora. On the ruins of the city and the temple, the Pharisaic Judaism, which rested upon the ancient Jews, was organized, and the decisions of the Pharisees were re-organized, and the decisions of the Restoration of the Jewish kingdom, according to the Pharisaic Judaism, were passed. The seat of the spiritual head, or patriarch, was now transferred from Jamnia to Tiberias, where it remained till the year 429. When, in the fifth century, Palestine ceased to be the centre of Judaism, Babylonia took her place. From the period of the exile a numerous and coherent body of Jews had continued to subsist there. The Parthians and Sassanians granted them self-government. At their head was a native prince, or Rash Ghalata, who, when the Jewish patriarchate came to an end, was left without a rival. The schools there at the time of the Babylonian Talmud, compiled about the year 500.

In the Roman Empire, after the reign of Vespasian and Hadrian, the position of the Jews was not only tolerable, but in many respects prosperous. Their position changed entirely after the conversion of Constantine. The Jews, who formerly had taken a great share in the operations of the Christians by pagan Rome, became now a condemned and persecuted sect. A gleam of hope shone upon them in the days of Julian the Apostate; but they were only the more ill treated under his Christian successors, especially by Justinian.

At the beginning of the seventh century, with the rise of Mahomet, better times were ushered in for the Jews, notwithstanding the fact that they were expelled from Arabia by Omar; but outside of Arabia, in Mauritania and Spain, they thrived especially well. In the latter country their prosperous condition lasted so long as the Catholic Church did not dominate the State. In the Germanic states which arose upon the ruins of the Roman Empire, the Jews fared well on the whole, especially under the Frankish monarchy. The Carolingians helped them in every possible way, making no account of the complaints of the bishops.

Meanwhile the Church was not remiss in seeking constantly repeated re-enactments of the old laws which she enacted in former years. Gradually she succeeded. The feudal system, and the crusading spirit of the middle ages, only tended to lower the position of the Jews in Christian society. Only was intercourse with them shunned: they were also obliged to wear a little wheel upon their dress as a mark. Outbreaks against the Jews were of repeated occurrence; and though popes and other prelates set themselves against such persecutions, yet the popular aversion against the Jew was too strong. It was not only religious hate, which was accompanied by repeated deadly outbreaks,—especially when the Black Death, in 1348, was raging, and Jews were blamed for it, on the notion they had poisoned the wells and rivers,—but also worldly considerations. The Jews, having at that time the control of financial affairs in their hands, used it without scruple, and thus made themselves still more repugnant to the Christians than they previously were by means of their religion. Thus it came about, that, where the spirit of toleration was exhausted, the Jews had to leave the country. England was the first kingdom in which this occurred, under Edward I. in 1290; France followed in 1385; Spain and Portugal, in 1492 and 1495.

In this way it happened that Germany, Italy, and adjoining districts became the chief abode of the Jews. In the German Empire the Jews, as Kamerknechte, or servants of the imperial chamber, enjoyed protection of person and property for a tax paid to the emperor. In some respects they maintained a kind of autonomy, and settled civil affairs among themselves by the diction of their rabbis. And though they had to suffer from the popular rage, which often marked its course by bloodshed and desolation, yet the Jews maintained their ground on account of the political confusion then prevailing in Germany;
and, if they were expelled from one locality, they readily found refuge in some other. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, Western Europe was almost depopulated of Jews. Most of them lived in Germany, Italy, Poland, and in the Osmanie and African states. In small numbers they were found in India, Malabar, Cochchin, Bokhara, China, and Abyssinia. Very few ventured to the west, whilst many European exiles sought refuge, especially from Spain, on account of persecution under Ferdinand and Isabella. Very large congregations were soon formed at Constantinople, Smyrna, Damascus, and other places.

The Reformations opened a new and better era to the Jews. Not that the Reformers personally were more tolerant towards them than the Roman-Catholic hierarchy; but the very fact that the boosted unity of the Church had received a serious blow made people more inclined to toleration. The fury of persecution, formerly directed against the Jews, was now directed against the heretics in the bosom of Christianity itself; and whilst the Jews were left alone, yet the anathema of public contempt, humiliation, and exclusion from every public or private connection, still lay heavily upon them. The period which intervened between the Reformation and the French Revolution was of a monotonous character to the Jews, with the exception of a few instances which attracted public attention. Thus in 1677 rose the pseudo-Messiah, Sabbatai Zevi, born at Smyrna in 1625, and died at Belgrade, as a Mohammedan. Notwithstanding the apostasy of this pretender, there were some who upheld his claims even after his death, and asserted that he was still the true Messiah, and that he was to return from the dead. A few years later, this heresy appeared under a new form, and under the guidance of two Polish rabbis, who travelled extensively to propagate Sabbataisism, which had its followers from Smyrna to Amsterdam, and even in Poland. In 1722 the whole sect was solemnly exorcised in all the synagogues of Europe. In 1750 Jacob Frank, a native of Poland, made his appearance, and caused a schism in the synagogues of his native country, and founded the sect of the "Frankists." The most extraordinary movement which occurred among the Jews in the eighteenth century was that of the sect termed the "Chassidim" (see art.).

Contemporary with the rise and progress of this sect, there lived in Germany the famous Moses Mendelssohn (see art.), b. in 1729 at Dessau, d. at Berlin, 1786, a man whose remarkable talents and writings constituted an era in the history of the modern Jews. He destroyed all respect for the Talmud and rabbinic writings among the Jews who approved his opinions, and thus rendered them dissatisfied with their religion, and drove them, on the one hand, either to the adoption of total infidelity, or of Christianity, on the other, as in the case of his own children.

Six years before Mendelssohn's death, Joseph II. ascended the throne of Austria, and issued in 1782 his edict of toleration, which marked for the Jews the beginning of a new era in the German Empire, as well as in the other Austrian countries. A century before, the Elector of Brandenburg, Frederick William, had already paved the way for this change. Peter the Great admitted them into Russia; England received them again; the Netherlands, Denmark, and Hanover were opened to them; whilst in North America and Brazil they built colonies. The example set in 1783 by the American Union, which allowed to her citizens the free exercise of their religion, without respect of creed, was followed by the French Revolution, which in 1791 declared the Jews French citizens. In 1796 they were emancipated in the Netherlands; in 1848, in Germany. At present the Jews occupy the most prominent positions everywhere. As for the Jews in general, they divide themselves into the Chassidim, or strict rabbinic Jews; the Karaites (see art.), or the Protestants of Judaism, who took their rise in the eighteenth century, rejecting entirely the authority of tradition; the orthodox Jews; and the reformed, or liberal Jews. All these parties are separated from Christendom by their religion. The emancipation of the Jews, it is true, has brought about many changes among them. They imitate the manners of the Gentiles not only in their social position, but also in religious matters. Their synagogue choirs are mostly composed of Christian singers. They have the rite of confirmation; they use organs; and the service, with a few exceptions, is held in the language of the country. But all these imitations bring them not nearer to the Church, the founder of which they regard as an Essene, and not as the Christ, the promised Messiah. Whatever the destinies of this people in the hands of Providence may be, certain it is that God has great things in store for the Jews, for whose conversion the Church has to pray till Jesus is all in all.

According to calculations published in 1881, there are 5,166,326 Jews in Europe, 402,996 in Africa, 182,847 in Asia, 307,963 in America, and 20,000 in Australia; or 6,080,132 Jews in the world, exclusive of 200,000 Falashas (Appletons' Annual Cyclopaedia for 1881, p. 456). See Jews, Missions among the.

ITALY, Ecclesiastical Statistics of. The kingdom of Italy comprises an area of 113,000 square miles, with a population of 28,000,000, of which 100,000 are Greek Catholics, 86,000 Evangelical Christians, 36,000 Jews, and 23,000 Mohammedans, while all the rest belong to the Roman-Catholic Church.

The Roman-Catholic Church.—Sept. 20, 1870, the temporal power of the Pope gilded quietly out of existence; but May 13, 1871, the legislative assembly of the kingdom passed a law guaranteeing the independence of the Pope and the holy see. The person of the Pope is sacred and inviolable, like that of the king. The honors of sovereignty are due to him, and he is allowed to keep a body-guard. The State pays him annually a pension of 3,225,000 lire, which, however, he has hitherto declined to receive; and the palaces of the Vatican and the Lateran, and the villa of Castle Gandolfo, with their libraries and collections, are declared to be the property of the holy see, inalienable, free of taxation, and exempt from expropriation. The Italian Government renders no other service than supporting idle persons, while the rest was eaten up by contemplation.

The legislature since 1855 has disestablished about fifty thousand ecclesiastical foundations, which rendered no other service than supporting idleness, ignorance, and vice. From the closed monasteries the monks and nuns returned into society with the full rights and duties of citizens; but of each of them a pension varying from one hundred to six hundred lire, according to age and other circumstances. The confiscated estates became State domains, but were gathered into a special fund, from which the ecclesiastical pensions, the expenses of public education, etc., are paid. The capital value of the property which has thus accrued to the domain since 1855 is estimated at 839,776,076 lire, yielding an annual income of 4,780,891 lire.

The Roman-Catholic Church in Italy numbers 265 episcopal dioceses (of which eleven archbishops, episcopal and sixty-two episcopal sees are independent of any metropolitan authority, and stand immediately under the Pope); and 24,980 parishes, which vary very much in size, from fourteen thousand to one hundred souls. The parish priest is always landholder, and derives his principal income from his patronage, but the State spends yearly about one million lire in augmentation of the
parochial stipends. The rite employed is the ordinary Latin rite, though other rites are recognized. Thus the Albanians in the southern provinces use the Greek rite and the Greek language in their worship, and their priests are allowed to marry. Other differences of rite occur among the Armenians in Venice and in the church of Milan.

The Evangelical Church is represented in Italy by the old and celebrated Church of the Waldensians, the Free Italian Church, and various more or less successful endeavors by the Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians, and other denominations.

By a decree of Feb. 17, 1848, religious liberty was established in the kingdom of Sardinia. The Church of the Waldensians consisted at that time of fifteen congregations up among the mountains, and one in Turin. But it immediately took on a considerable missionary activity, and afterwards formed 30 new congregations in various parts of Italy, with 34 ordained pastors, 23 evangelists, 44 teachers, 2,513 communicants, and about 400 catechumens, 1,084 pupils in the primary schools, and 1,638 in the Sunday school. It was in the very nature of the case that the professor and eighteen students, founded in 1855 at Torre Pellice, but removed in 1862 to Florence. Before the establishment of this school the Waldensian ministers were educated at Lausanne or Geneva.

The Free Italian Church was founded in Milan (1870) by twenty-three congregations, which had been formed independently of the Waldensian evangelization. It numbers (report of 1881) now 36 congregations, with 13 ordained ministers, 16 evangelists, 21 teachers, 1,750 communicants, 2,841 catechumens, 1,250 pupils in the week-day schools, 657 pupils in the Sunday schools, and a theological school with four professors and ten students in Rome. [Gavazzi is one of the leading spirits in this church.] The Methodists have in their northern missionary district 28 congregations, and 15 in their southern district, and in all 22 ordained preachers. [The American Methodists who began missionary efforts in Italy in 1873, have 15 Italian preachers, one American missionary (Dr. Vernon), 708 church-members, and 311 probationers. The Presbyterians work in Italy through the Waldensian and Free churches. The Church of England has three congregations in Rome. Dr. Robert Nevins is rector of the American Episcopal Church in Rome, which has the largest Protestant house of worship, built by his own exertions. The American Baptists have had an Italian mission since 1870, and now have nine preachers, and 175 communicants, with congregations at Milan, Rome, Naples, Venice, etc. The English Baptists have eleven preachers, and began their mission in 1871.

ITALY, Protestantism in. Every now and then the noblest and loftiest spirits produced by the Italian people—Dante, Petrarch, Laurentius Valla, Savonarola, Egidius of Viterbo, Picus de Miranda—burst out in protest against the corruption of the Church of Rome, and demanded reforms. Councils, such as those of Pisa and Constance, supported the movement; and popes, such as Adrian VI. and Paul III., took the lead of it, or at least made people believe that they did. The reforms demanded were purely moral, however, not doctrinal: it was a reform of the clergy, rather than a reform of the Church, which was intended. Thus the order of the Theatines was founded in 1524 by Cajetan of Thiene and Bishop Caraffa of Theate (afterwards Paul IV.), for the express purpose of reforming the clergy; but at the same time the Theatines were the bitterest enemies, the most furious persecutors, of the Reformation; and, as soon as it became apparent that a moral reform could not be accomplished, unless on the basis of a doctrinal reform, the council and the Pope, the monk and the prelate, at once agreed in calling in the Inquisition for the purpose of stamping out "heresy." In Italy all the necessary materials for a moral reform were absolutely lacking. The revival of letters, which had been more vigorous there than in any other country, turned out to be essentially a revival of Paganism, and resulted in a religious indifferentism and cynical scepticism, which might have a great talent for railing at vices, but certainly showed very little power to correct them. But, where such a spirit is reigning, no moral reform is possible: there the reform must begin with the spirit, the idea, the doctrine. In the case of Italy, evidences were plenty and striking. The consilium novemviral, consisting of Contarini, Pole, Caraffa, Sadolet, Fregoso, Giberti, Badia, Cortese, and Alesandre, which Paul III. organized in 1536 for the purpose of reforming the chancery, the episcopacy, the morals of the clergy, the penitential, the administration of the rota, etc., barely escaped having its report put on the Index; for it was, indeed, impossible to explain the causes of the reigning evils, and indicate remedies against them, without touching upon questions of doctrine. But a doctrinal reform the Church of Rome neither would nor could consent to; for it surely meant a revision and consequent alteration of her whole social and political position. As soon, therefore, as Paul III. came to understand that this cry for reform, which had arisen spontaneously in Italy, and earlier there than in any other country, was in principle identical with the Reformation in Germany, he handed over the whole case to the Inquisition (established by a bull of June 21, 1842); and, two generations later on, every trace of Protestantism was wiped off from the face of Italy.

In Northern Italy the transition from a moral to a doctrinal reform took place under the influence of the Reformation in Germany. The works of the reformers—Luther, Melanchthon, Zwingli, and Butzer—were early introduced into Venice, often under fictitious names. Thus the Loci communes of Melanchthon circulated under the name of Hippopholis de Terra Negra. In 1520 the writings of Luther were seized and burnt by the Patriarch Contarini, which, however, did not prevent them from being clandestinely reprinted, and widely read. In 1543 Luther was in actual correspondence with the Venetian Government through Baldassari Altei, secretary to the English embassy in Venice. The rapid spread of Protestantism in the territory of the Republic during the period 1520-42 was, to a great extent, due to the indefatigable exertions of Altei, supported by the fervent preachings of a number of monks, and the translation of the Bible by Brucioli, a disciple of Savonarola. Of course the
Roman curia protested in the most vehement manner. But the Venetian ambassador, Tiepolo, had the cynical frankness to tell Pius V. to his face, that toleration or intoleration with respect to heretics was to the Republic merely a question of policy. And so it was. As soon as the Republic needed the friendship of the Pope, the Inquisition was established; Altieri was banished, fifteen hundred and forty-five processes were instituted against Protestants of the higher classes, while those of the lower were tracked like game on the Lido. The archives of the Inquisition contain the acts of two hundred and forty-three processes instituted between 1541 and 1592; some against members of the first families,—the Giustiniani, Dandola, Falieri, etc.,—twenty-six against ecclesiastics; but thousands of persons were quietly burnt, drowned, decapitated, tortured, or exiled. The same proceedings were enacted throughout the whole territory of the Republic, in Vicentia, Padua, Bergamo, Treviso, Undino, etc. Into Lombardy—bowed north by Switzerland, and west by Piedmont—Protestantism penetrated in a double stream; and in the beginning of the sixteenth century several of the Lombard cities maintained connections with Geneva, Zürich, and Wittenberg. In 1521 verses were composed and sung in Milan in honor of Luther; and Gerdes tells us, that in 1524 the Reformation was preached there with great success. In 1530 Curio fled from Piedmont, and found refuge in Milan, just before the persecutions began. At he exercised a considerable influence, both by his writings, and still more through his friends,—Bernardino Ochino from Siena, general of the Capuchins, a celebrated preacher, who formed congregations at Venice, Florence, Siena, and Perugia, but fled to Geneva, Aug. 23, 1542; Peter Martyr Vermigli, professor of theology, first at Naples, afterwards at Lucca, strongly influenced by the reformers of Geneva, whither he fled a few days later than Ochino; Carnesecchi, who had been secretary to Clement VII., and twice escaped from the grip of the Inquisition (1546 and 1559), but finally fell a victim to the unconquerable hatred of Pius V. and the loose policy of Cosmas of Mediceis (1567); Flaminius, author of the beautiful book, _Del Benefizio di Gentiluomini_; Giustiniani, Dandola, Falieri, etc.,—twenty-six against ecclesiastics; and in 1555 Paleario could still write his _Actio in Pontifices Romanos_ undisturbed in Milan. The Inquisition hunted after with nearly as much appetite as after the Bible; and Caracciolo, who became the founder of the Italian congregation at Geneva. When the Inquisition began its work, it found large congregations formed by these men in nearly all the great cities of Central and Southern Italy; and, what was still worse, in many cases it found the very officers of the Church most strongly affected by the disease it was sent to extirpate. In the environs of Naples the bishops of Chironia, Sorrente, Isola, Caiazzo, Mola, Civita di Penna, Policeastro, Reggio, etc., read the works of Luther, and were more or less infected with Lutheranism. Most of them ranted immediately; but some of them it was necessary to punish. Yes, at some places the Inquisition had to supplement itself with laymen in order to be sure of having no heretics among its own members. His merciless severity has something noble in its motives, which commands respect. He was able, chiefly by the aid of the Inquisition and the Jesuits, not only to cleanse Milan thoroughly from heresy, but also to make it a barrier against all influence from Germany. In Piedmont there existed at the beginning of the sixteenth century numerous evangelical congregations founded by missionaries of the Waldensian Church (which see). But also the influence from Geneva and Wittenberg was considerable. When Calvin, in 1536, passed through the valley of Aosta, he found many adherents; and in 1560 it was said, even of the Princess Margaretta, that she was a secret Calvinist. But in Piedmont, as in Venice, political regards compelled the government to yield to the Pope's demands. The Inquisition was established; and in cases in which it was found impossible to apply this instrument,—namely, when the question was not about individual persons, but about whole families, towns, districts,—the children were by force taken from the parents, and placed in convents, to be educated in the Roman-Catholic faith.

In Southern and Central Italy the movement was started by the circle of eminent men which formed in Naples (1535-40) around the Spaniard Valdez; but it was in many ways nourished, both through direct communication with the German reformers, and by the existence of evangelical congregations founded by Waldensian missionaries. Valdez fleeing from Spain on account of the satirical dialogue he wrote against the clergy. In Naples he lived very quietly, and he died before the persecutions began. But he exercised a considerable influence, both by his writings, and still more through his friends,—Bernardino Ochino from Siena, general of the Capuchins, a celebrated preacher, who formed congregations at Venice, Florence, Siena, and Perugia, but fled to Geneva, Aug. 23, 1542; Peter Martyr Vermigli, professor of theology, first at Naples, afterwards at Lucca, strongly influenced by the reformers of Geneva, whither he fled a few days later than Ochino; Carnesecchi, who had been secretary to Clement VII., and twice escaped from the grip of the Inquisition (1546 and 1559), but finally fell a victim to the unconquerable hatred of Pius V. and the loose policy of Cosmas of Mediceis (1567); Flaminius, author of the beautiful book, _Del Benefizio di Gentiluomini_.
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working in this manner for about half a century, the Inquisition succeeded in completely silencing Protestantism in Italy; and nothing further was heard from this movement until the fourth and fifth decade of the present century. See arts. WALDENSIANS, and ITALY, ECCLESIASTICAL STATISTICS OF.

Lit. — Dr. LEVA. Storia di Carlo V., vols. i. and iii., 1875; E. COMBA, in the Rivista Christiana, 1873–74; the same: Storia dei martiri della Riforma italiana, vol. i., Turin, 1879; and Storia della Riforma in Italia, vol. i., Florence, 1881; JOHN STOUTGTON: Footsteps of the Italian Reformers, London, 1881. See also, for further literature, the special biographies, and K. BENRATH: Uber d. Quellen d. Wallischen Reformationsgeschichte, Bonn, 1876.

ITINERANCY. Our Lord had no settled place of abode and no fixed congregation. The apostles similarly went from place to place, at least during a portion of their ministry. Methodists thus find Scripture precedent for their peculiar system of ministerial appointments. The ministers of this denomination, in the settled parts of this country, are assigned to churches by the bishop, but are not allowed to hold the same charge more than three consecutive years; then they are put over another church in the same conference. In this way they move from place to place in the conference. In England and upon our frontiers, the circuit-system prevails; i.e., a number of churches or preaching-places are served by the same set of preachers in rotation. There can be no question of the immense value of this itinerant system in the past history of the Methodist Church. It was started by John Wesley, who, as early as his third conference (May, 1746), assigned the lay-preaching to certain fields of labor called then and now "circuits." But, owing to the altered circumstances of the church, the question of abolishing the system, or greatly modifying it, has been of late very earnestly debated. The weight of opinion seems to be against any essential change. See METHODISM.

ITURAEA, the country of the Itureans, was at one time identified with Auranitis, or Trachonitis (Eusebius, Jerome, and others), in direct contradiction of Luke iii. 1. Modern archaeologists have placed it in the plains of north-eastern Galilee, or on the eastern spurs of the Hauran Mountains; but neither of these locations agrees with the notes of ancient writers. As the Itureans were a nomadic tribe, they may have lived at various places in various times. They descended from Ishmael (Gen. xxv. 15; 1 Chron. i. 31), and, together with other Arabian tribes, they fought with the Israelites settled east of the Jordan (1 Chron. v. 18–22). Aristobulus I. conquered them (105 B.C.); but Pompey was the first who really succeeded in subduing them. Afterwards they are often mentioned as excellent soldiers, serving as archers in the Roman army. Their country often changed dominion until Claudius definitively incorporated it with Syria. See FRIEDRICH MÜNTZER: De rebus Ituraeorum, Copenhagen, 1824. — RÜETSCHI.

IVES, Rt. Rev. Levi Silliman, D.D., LL.D., b. at Meriden, Conn., Sept. 16, 1797; d. at Manhattanville, New-York City, Oct. 13, 1877. He came of Presbyterian stock; but in 1819 he became an Episcopalian, and in 1823 he was ordained priest, and settled over Trinity Church, Philadelphia. In 1831 he was consecrated bishop of North Carolina, and displayed zeal and ability in the religious education of the slaves. He was a High Churchman, and sided with the Oxford Tractarians. In December, 1852, he visited Rome, and there joined the Roman Church. His friend and confessor, Dr. Forbes, went with him, but returned again to the Episcopal Church. Ives was deposed from his bishopric (Oct. 14, 1853), but made professor of rhetoric in St. Joseph's (R.C.) Theological Seminary at Fordham, N.Y. Among his last labors was the founding of the Protectory for Roman-Catholic children at Westchester, N.Y., and of the Manhattanville College, where he taught. He published an apology for his secession, The Trials of a Mind in its Progress to Catholicism, London and Boston, 1854.

IVO OF CHARTRES (Ivo Carnotensis), b. about 1040 in the diocese of Beauvais; d. at Chartres, Dec. 28, 1116; studied humaniores and philosophy in Paris, and theology in the monastery of Bec, where he had Lanfranc for teacher, and Anselm for a schoolmate, and was appointed director of the monastery of St. Quentin in 1075, and bishop of Chartres in 1090. He was implicated in grave controversies, first with his predecessor, Ganfried, who had been deposed by the Pope on account of simony, but still found many adherents in France, and afterward with Philippe I., who had repudiated his legitimate spouse, Bertha, and entered into an adulterous connection with Bertrade of Anjou. But the most interesting point in his life is the stand-point he occupied in the great contest concerning the right of investiture (see his letters 63, 232, 236, and 240). He was distinguished his views, and governed all his actions. Of his works the two most important are his collections of canons: Decretum or Decretorum Opus in seventeen books, and Pannormia in eight books. His letters, numbering two hundred and eighty-seven, have also great interest for the history of his time. Whether the Breve chronicon de rebus Francorum is by him is uncertain; but the Historia ecclesiastica was written by Hugh of Fleury. A collected edition of his works (except the Pannormia), Paris, 1647, has been reprinted by Migne, Patr. Lat., tom. 157, 161. Biographies of him were written by I. Fronteau (Hamburg, 1720), Abry (Strassburg, 1841), and Ritzke (Basel, 1889). — WAGENMANN.
JAB'BOK, the present Zurks, a stream which rises in the plateau east of Gilead, cuts through Gilead in a narrow defile, and empties itself into the Jordan, about midway between the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea. It formed the northern boundary of Ammon, and separated the kingdoms of Sihon and Og (Num. xx. 24; Deut. iii. 37, iii. 16; Josh. xii. 2; Judg. xi. 13, 22). On the south bank of the Jabbok the interview took place between Jacob and Esau (Gen. xxxii. 22).

JABLONSKI, Daniel Ernst, b. at Nassenhuben, near Danzig, Nov. 20, 1660; d. in Berlin, May 25, 1741; studied theology and oriental languages at Frankfort-on-the-Oder and Oxford, and was appointed pastor of the Reformed congregation in Magdeburg in 1683, pastor of the Polish congregation in Lissa in 1686, court-preacher at Königsberg in 1671, and court-preacher at Berlin in 1697. He sprang originally from the Bohemian diaspora, and was consecrated bishop in 1699. In 1709 he consecrated Count Zinzendorf bishop, and thus he formed the transition from the old stock of the Moravian Brethren to the younger branch of the Hennhuters. In the church-history of Prussia he distinguished himself by his exertions to bring about a union between the Lutheran and Reformed churches. But his long negotiations with Leibnitz, who represented a similar tendency in Hanover, came to a sudden end in 1706, chiefly on account of the indiscretion of superintendent Winkler of Magdeburg. He published several collections of sermons, and an annotated text of the Hebrew Bible, which is still of value. See KAPPE: Sammlung vertrauter Briefe Leibnitzens und Jablonskis, Leipzig, 1747; SACK: Relation des méres... pour introduire la liturgie gallicane dans le royaume (1e II. 22—xxviii. 23); (2) His mature years (xxix. 1—xxxv. 29); (3) His old age (xxxvii. 1—xlix. 33).

(1) The characteristic feature of his early years was his desire to get the birthright from Esau. He began the struggle before he was born (xxv. 22), took advantage of his twin-brother's momentary despair to buy it from him for a mess of potage (xxxv. 33), and finally got the blessing by fraud (xxxvii.). For this act of perfidy he had to flee, and went to Haran, where his uncle (Laban) lived. On his way thither he had a vision at Luz, in consequence of which he called the place Bethel. (2) Kindly received by his uncle, he fell in love with Rachel, and served seven years for her, only to be cheated by the substitution of the older daughter, Leah, for Rachel, on the wedding-night,—a proceeding which the Eastern marriage-customs render comparatively easy. He had therefore to serve another seven years for his chosen wife. Leah bore him four sons successively,—Reuben, Simeon, Levi, and Judah; while Rachel remained childless. By Rachel's maid, Bilhah, Jacob had Dan and Naphtali; by Leah's maid, Zilpah, Gad and Asher; by Leah herself, Issaachar, Zebulun, and his only daughter men tioned,—Dinah. At length God remembered Rachel, and she bore Joseph. Not only in children, but in all his possessions, manifestly favored, it is no wonder Laban desired him to stay; but Jacob had become weary of the long subsection and the frequent trickery (xxxix. 7), and, knowing that Laban would not willingly let him go, he departed secretly, was pursued, overtaken, came to an understanding with Laban, and so in peace started once more for Canaan. The news of the approach of his brother with his band alarmed him. But ere he met his brother, a change was wrought in him. He wrestled at the Jabbok with
God all night, until the breaking of the day, and, in reward of his persistence, received the blessing he so earnestly desired, and a new name, — Israel. But, ere granting his request, the "man" touched the sinew of Jacob's thigh, and it shrank, cutting his thigh out of joint. To his surprise, Esau was very friendly; and the brothers separated peacefully, to meet once more at the funeral of their father. Jacob settled first in Shechem, but was compelled to leave in consequence of Simeon's and Levi's conduct, and went to Bethel, and thence to Hebron. On this latter journey, Rachel died at Bethlehem, shortly after hearing the news. She was naturalized in the tribe of Benjamin. (3) In Hebron the patriarch lived quietly, passed through heavy sorrows and hard times, and was buried in the burial-place of Machpelah. The city was destroyed by the Philistines. The night of weeping was followed by joy. He left Hebron at the summons of Joseph, was personally honored by the Pharaoh, and in prosperity and tranquility passed his last days in the land of Goshen. When he felt the hand of death upon him, he gathered his sons about him, prophesied the fortunes of their respective descendants, and died at the age of a hundred and forty-seven years. His funeral was attended with royal pomp.

The character of this remarkable man is best expressed by his double name. Jacob was he; for he was naturally adroit and sly, and thus got the better of the physically stronger, more warlike Esau, and the egoistical, calculating Laban. Yet he was not sordid in his aims. He sought something higher than mere earthly possessions, and so he was Israel: for he wrestled for the divine blessing as the most valuable thing one could have; to win it, he summoned all his energy, and underwent every deprivation. It was the ambition of his life. He began the struggle in his mother's womb, and kept this end steadily in view, until, in the maturity of his powers, he received it. It is true he was far from being perfect. In him the lower nature was in conflict with the higher, and often victorious; but, in the course of a life much more troubled than that of any other patriarch in the Bible, he saw God as a well near the city of Sychar, in Samaria, on the parcel of ground which the patriarch Jacob gave to his son Joseph (compare Gen. xxxviii. 19; Josh. xxiiv. 32). There the Lord sat down once while travelling from Judea to Galilee, weared from the journey, and then occurred the wonderful conversation related in John iv. 7—28. The place can still be identified with certainty, as situated one mile and a half to the south-east of the town of Nablus, the ancient Shechem, close by the highway from Jerusalem to Galilee, at the eastern base of Mount Gerizim. The well, which is lined with masonry, is now only seventy-five feet deep, and mostly dry, it having been filled up with debris of the adjacent ruined buildings; but in 1838, when Robinson visited it, it was a hundred and five feet deep. Jerome, in his Onomasticon, tells us that at this time a church built over the well occupied the site. That church was destroyed during the crusades; but in the twelfth century it was replaced by a chapel, which now also has fallen into ruins. See Conder: Sycar and Sychem, in Statements, 1877, p. 149; [Schaaff: Through Bible Lands, 1878, p. 312.] Ruetschi.

JACOB BARADÆUS, b. at Tellis; was educated in the monastery of Phasalitra, near Nisibis, and lived for fifteen years in Constantinople as a monk, when, in the year 543, he consecrated bishop of Nisibis by Theodosius, the Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, who was held a prisoner in Constantinople. In this position he labored with great energy and success for the reorganization and consolidation of the scattered Monophysite party in the East. "Light-footed as Asehel" (2 Sam. ii. 18), and clad in rags (whence Baradat, "a coarse horse-blanket"), he wandered from the boundary of Egypt to the banks of the Eufrates, preaching during the day, and often walking thirty or forty miles in the night, thus escaping his persecutors. He consecrated two patriarchs, twenty-seven (according to another reading, eighty-seven) bishops, and a hundred thousand priests and deacons. No wonder, therefore, that the whole party was called, after him, the Jacobites. Of written monuments he left very little. An anaphora, translated into Latin by Renaudot (Lit. Or. Coll., ii. 385), is ascribed to him; also a Confession, of which an Ethiopian version is extant in several manuscripts, edited and translated by Cornill, in Zeitschrift d. Deut. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, 1876. A number of his ecclesiastical letters are in a Syrian manuscript in the British Museum. D. July 30, 578.

JACOB OF EDESSA (Syriac, Orrhoenous), b. in the middle of the seventh century, at 'Indaba, near Antioch; studied in Alexandria, and was in 687 appointed bishop of Edessa, but resigned in 688, on account of disputes with his clergy, and lived eleven years in the monastery of Eusebium, then nine years in the great monastery of Tell 'edra. When his successor in the see of Edessa, Habib, died, in 708, he was invited to resume office. He consented, but died while on the journey to Edessa, June 5. He wrote on theology, history, philosophy, and grammar. He was master of three languages,—Syriac, Greek, and Hebrew. He corrected the Syriac version of the Old Testament, and translated books of Aristotle, Porphyry, the two Gregories, and others, into Syriac: his literary accomplishments were, indeed, of the very highest order. Of his works much has come down to us, and is found in the libraries of London, Paris, Florence, and Rome. See the respective catalogues of Syriac manuscripts. Something has also been published: his Syriac grammar, edited by Wright, London, 1871; several of his
letters in **ASSEMANI: Bibliotheca Orientalis, i**: 485–494; and by **WRIGHT: Journal of Sacred Literature, 1867.** See also **BARHEBREUS: Chronicon Ecclesiast.** (1873, j. 289).  

**E. NESTLE.**

**JACOB OF JÜTERBOGK, b.** at Jüterbogk, in the Prussian province of Brandenburg, 1381; d. at Erfurt, 1405 or 1406; entered the Polish monastery, the Paradise, and was by its abbot sent to Cracow to study; found the rules of the Cistercian order too lax, and adopted those of the Carthusian order, 1411; removed to the monastery, *ad montem St. Salvatoris*, in Erfurt, and labored in the university there as professor of canon law. He has a special interest on account of his reformatory zeal. Not that he in any way felt himself at variance with the doctrines of the Church; but he fully realized the corruption of her morals, and spoke with great frankness of the necessary reforms in *Petitiones religiosorum pro reformatione sui status; De negligentiapartelatorum; Avisamentum ad papam*, addressed to Nicholas necessary reforms in Petitiones religiosorum pro reformatione sui status; De negligentiapartelatorum; Avisamentum ad papam, addressed to Nicholas. He has a special interest on account of his writings. Some have been printed in *Breviarium Feudale Syriacum Dominicum*; **ASSEMANI: Act. Sanct. Mart., i.**; **CURETON: Ancient Syriac Documents, 1864; Monumenta Syrica, i.; ABBELOS: J. B. de vita et scriptis S. J. Bat. Sar., Louvain, 1867.** His memory is greatly revered by the Jacobites and Maronites, and even by the later Nestorians; though, according to documents published by Abbe Martin, in *Zeitschrift d. Deutsch. Morgenländ. Gesellschaft, 1876*, he remained a Monophysite to his death. A Life of him was written by Jacob of Edessa, *Bibl. Orient.*, i.; another (anonymous) is found in *Act. Sanct. Oct. 12, 929, and in ABBELOS, i.e. See ABBE MARTIN: *Un Évêque Polon; in Revues des Sciences Ecclesiastiques, 4* ser. t. iii., October, November, 1876.  

**E. NESTLE.**

**JACOB OF VITRY (Jacobus Vitriacus, or de Vitriaco), b.** at Vitry-sur-Seine, 1170; d. in Rome, April 30, 1240; was appointed *presbyter parochialis*, at Argenae, near Paris, 1200, but gave up this position in 1210, and removed to the monastery of Oignies, in the diocese of Liège, attracted by the sanctity of the Belgian nun Mary, whose life he wrote (ed. by Fr. Moschus, *Arras, 1890*, and in *Act. Sanct.*, June 28). At the instance of the Pope he began in 1213 preaching a crusade against the Albigenses; and so great was the impression his eloquence produced (*Sermones, Antwerp, 1575; compare LE COY DE LA MARCHE: La Chaire francaise au moyen âge, 1868*), that in 1217 he was elected bishop of Poëlemais. In Palestine, where he remained for ten years, he made himself well approved, especially by the care he bestowed upon the children of the Saracen captives. But, shortly before the death of Honorius III., he seems to have returned to Oignies. Gregory IX., however, used him in many important diplomatical missions, and made him bishop of Prascati, and a cardinal. His principal work, *Histoire orientale et occidentale*, was first edited by Fr. Moschus, *Douay, 1597*, then by Martine and Durand, in *Thes. Nov. Anecd.*, iii., Paris, 1717. His letters have also great interest; see **MARTENE, i.e., and BONGARSIUS: Gesta Dei per Francos, i.** See **MATZNER: De J. Vitri., Münster, 1884.**  

**WAGENMANN.**

**JACOBI, Friedrich Heinrich, b.** at Düsseldorf, Jan. 25, 1743; d. at Pempelfort, an estate he possessed near his native city, March 10, 1819; was educated, at Francfort and Geneva, for a commercial career, but showed from early youth great inclination to still his literary pursuits. In 1768 he took the lead of the mercantile concern his father had established at Düsseldorf; and in 1770 he was made a member of the council for the duchies of Jaliers and Berg. In 1779 he was invited to Munich to take a similar position; but, not finding circumstances there to his taste, he retired to Cracow, where he remained until the war drove him away, 1793. He went to Holstein, and staid there for ten years. In 1814 he was again invited to Munich, as presi-
dent of the academy; and he remained there till 1812. His first literary productions were Alcide's Brief-Sammlung (1774) and Weidemar (1779), two philosophical novels, of which especially the latter gives an easy outline of his philosophical speculations. In 1785 his Brief über die Lehre Spinozas implicated him in a controversy with Moses Mendelssohn and the Berlin philosophers; and in 1787 a similar conflict with Kant and the critical school ensued from his David Hume über den Glauben. In 1801 he published one of his most important works, "Über das Unternehmen des Kriticius die Vernunft zu Verstehen," and in 1811 his last great book, Von den göttlichen Dingen, which called forth a very bitter rejoinder from Schelling. Jacobi's philosophy is not a system: on the contrary, his fundamental principle—the limitation of thought, its incapability to explain the existence of facts, to do anything more than connect them with each other—made an exact opposition to any purely demonstrative system. All thought, when applied alone, and carried resolutely to its last consequences, ends in atheism and fatalism. It needs to be supplemented with faith, which is the only organ of objective truth. Nevertheless, though Jacobi, as the "philosopher of faith," rests his speculations on intuition as their proper foundation, he is very far from the romantic fancifulness of Schelling. He was a sharp critic; and Schelling, as well as Kant, felt the penetrating power of his searching eye. In this point, as in many others, he resembles Sir William Hamilton, who, indeed, owed not a little to him. His works were collected by himself and provided with very instructive prefaces and appendixes. His letters were edited by Roth, 1825-27, 2 vols. His life was written by Kuhn: Jacobi und die Philosophie seiner Zeit, 1854, and Zierknebel: Jacobis Leben, Dichten, und Denken, 1867.

The peculiar doctrines and institutions which distinguish the Jacobites are, the conception of one nature in Christ, resulting from a perfect blending of the divine and human in him, according to the formula, ex duabus naturis, non in duabus; the rejection of the canons of the council of Chalcedon, while those of the second council of Ephesus, the so-called "Robber Synod," are accepted: the veneration of Jacob of Sarug, Jacob of Edessa, Dioscorus, Severus, Petrus Fullo, and Jacob Baradeus as teachers and saints, while Enycthes is condemned; the use of leavened bread in the Lord's Supper; the making of the sign of the cross with one finger; the frequent application of the lot at elections of bishops and patriarchs. The Jacobite patriarch is styled "Patriarch of Antioch;" but the Greeks, who consider the Jacobites as heretics, have never allowed him to reside there. In the latter part of the ninth century it became customary for the patriarch to change his name on his election; and in the fourteenth Ignatius became the fixed name of the Jacobite patriarch, as Peter is that of the Maronite, Joseph that of the Chaldean, and Simon or Elijah, that of the Nestorian patriarchs. The Jacobite Church has produced quite a number of distinguished men, scholars, authors, etc. See Assemani: Bibl. Orient., ii. The various attempts of the Roman-Catholic Church to bring about a reconciliation with the Jacobites have not led to any remarkable results.


JACOBUS DE VORAGINE. b. at Siraggio, 1230; d. in Genoa, 1298; entered the order of the Preaching Friars in 1244, and was made archbishop of Genoa in 1292. His great fame he owes to his collection of legends.—Legenda Sanctorum, Legenda Aurea, also called Historia Longobardica, from the short Lombard chronicle attached.
to the life of Pope Pelagius. The materials of which the book is composed were derived partly from apocryphal gospels, acts of apostles, acts of martyrs, and partly from medieval traditions of the wildest description; but just this made it acceptable to the time. It was translated into all European languages [into English by William Caxton, in the fifteenth century], and reprinted over and over again. He also wrote a number of sermons (Sermones de Sanctis, Lyons, 1494; Mariale, Venice, 1497, etc.) and a book in defence of the Dominican order. His Chronicle of Genoa is found in Muratori: Scriptores Rerum Italicarum, ix. C. Schmidt.

JACOBUS. Melancthon Williams, D.D., LL.D., b. at Newark, N.J., Sept. 19, 1816; d. at Allegheny, Penn., Oct. 28, 1876. He was graduated at the College of New Jersey, 1834, and at Princeton Theological Seminary, 1838; taught in the Hebrew department for a year; was pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn, 1839-50; and from 1851 till his death was professor of Oriental and biblical literature in the theological seminary at Allegheny, Penn. In 1869 he was moderator of the General Assembly (Old School), the last assembly before the re-union. He was the author of a popular series of Notes on the New Testament, of which there appeared Matthew, with Harmony (New York, 1848), Mark and Luke (1853), John (1859), and in 1864-65 Notes on the Book of Genesis, 2 vols. His Notes on the New Testament were republished in Edinburgh, 1882. See sketch of his life in Presby-ter Chrislum nova mundum arle delusilet caelum (ix. 25); the latter, her joys at the manger. The Stabat mater has been attributed to Gregory the Great (d. 606), Bernard of Clairvaux (d. 1153), and Innocent III. It is anonymous in the copies of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; but the uniform tradition attributes it to Jacopone, and there is no sufficient reason why we should not hold to it. The Flagellants, who marched through Italy in 1398, sang it [Summa historalis, b Anto-ninus Florentinus (d. 1450); Annale of Detmar of Lübeck and Georg Stella (d. 1420)].

The Stabat mater is the most pathetic hymn of the middle ages or any other age. It is defaced by Mariolatry, but its soft melody and tender pathos will always delight and soothe the ear. It has frequently been set to music; first by Nanini (about 1620), and since by Astorga (about 1700), Palestrina, Pergolese (about 1736), Haydn, Rossini, and others. It is sung to Palestrina's music on Palm Sunday at Rome, and in fifty-three German translations of the Stabat mater; and it has often been translated into English by Lord Lindsay, Caswall, Coles, Benedict, etc. The Mater speciosa has been translated by Dr. Neale, Coles, Benedict, etc.

JACOBONE DA Todi, the author of the Stabat mater, b. at Todi, Italy, about 1245; d. Dec. 31, 1306, in the convent of Collazone. His real name was Jacopo de Benedetti, or Jacobus de Benedicti (the Latin form), Benedetti being the family name. He spent the years of early manhood in revelry and carousing. His talents, however, won him both degrees of the law at Bologna. He gave himself up with enthusiasm to the practice of law, when the whole tenor of his life was suddenly changed by the violent death of his wife, from the falling of a gallery in a theatre. He decided to become a monk, and one morning appeared in the market-place, on his hands and knees, harried like a beast of burden. He submitted to painful asceticism for ten years, when he was admitted, in 1278, to the Franciscan order of Minorites. He was led by the corruption of the Church to compose poems arranging Pope Boniface VIII. (1294-1303), and in 1297 entered into a controversy of Roman nobles to compass his deposition. For this he was placed in close confinement, and limited to bread and water, until the death of Boniface, in 1303. He spent his last days at Collazone, and lies buried at Todi, where the following inscription was placed over his re-
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JAEEL (y2; "wild goat"), the wife of Heber, the chief of a nomadic Arab tribe, was a heroine whose patriotic deed Deborah magnified in her triumphant songs of Roman nobles to compass his deposition. For this he was placed in close confinement, and limited to bread and water, until the death of Boniface, in 1303. He spent his last days at Collazone, and lies buried at Todi, where the following inscription was placed over his re-

JAEEL. Genoa is found in Mau'srom: Scriptures Rerum the wildest description; but just this made it acceptable to the time. It was translated into all European languages [into English by William Caxton, in the fifteenth century], and reprinted over and over again. He also wrote a number of sermons (Sermones de Sanctis, Lyons, 1494; Mariale, Venice, 1497, etc.) and a book in defence of the Dominican order. His Chronicle of Genoa is found in Muratori: Scriptores Rerum Italicarum, ix. C. Schmidt.
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with buttermilk, he fell asleep. While in this condition, Jael took a tent-pin, and drove it through his temples. The impassioned eulogy of Deborah was an instance of the suddenness of her death, and was a bold expression of the grief of the nation for its deliverance from its enemy. Jael's deed was rewarded by patriotic motives, and was a bold act; but the deed was carried out by a resort to treachery and a disregard of the laws of hospitality. The best treatment of the general subject of the justifiable murder will be found in Mozley's Ruling Ideas in Early Ages.

JAFFE, Philipp, b. at Schwerzenz, Posen, Feb. 17, 1819; d. in Berlin, April, 1870. He studied first medicine, but afterwards devoted himself to literature and history; was the collaborator of Pertz in the publication of the Monumenta Germaniae, 1854-63, and was in 1862 appointed professor of history in the University of Berlin. His principal works are, History of the Empire under Lothair the Saxon; History of the Empire under Conrad III.; Regesta Pontificum Romanaorum, 1861 (2 ed., 1881 sq.); and Bibliotheca Rerum Germanorum, 1864-69.

JAHN, Johann, b. at Tasswitz, Moravia, June 18, 1750; d. in Vienna, Aug. 16, 1816; entered the Premonstratensian order in 1774, and was in 1862 appointed professor of Oriental languages and exegesis at the gymnasia of Olmutz in 1784, and in the University of Vienna in 1789; but, as on several points of exegesis his views deviated from those maintained by the theologians of the curia, he was removed from his chair in 1805, and made canon of St. Stephen. His Introduction to the Old Testament and Arch. Biblicus were much used by students of the Syriac, Arab, and Chaldee languages. In English are his Biblical Archeology, Andover (U. S.), 1823, 5th ed., N. Y., 1849; and his History of the Hebrew Commonweal, Andover (U. S.), 1828, 2 vols., 3d ed. rev., Oxford, 1840.

JAINS, The name of a very numerous and wealthy sect among the Hindus, founded in the fifth or sixth century B.C., by Vardhamana, the Buddha. Their belief resembles Buddhism in some particulars, as in their reverence for life in all its forms, which leads them to scrupulously avoid destroying even insects. They are, too, accounted heretics by the orthodox Brahman. But in most respects they differ from Buddhists; as (a) in the use of the word "nirvana," by which they mean immortality, and the delivery of the soul from the bondage of transmigration, in consequence of the "practice of the four virtues,"—liberality, gentleness, piety, and remorse for failings,—by goodness in thought, word, and deed, and by kindness to the mute creation, and even to the forms of vegetable life; (b) in their theism, indeed almost monotheism; and (c) in the "sky-clad," i.e., naked, and their rejection to their own sacred books, called Agamas, which are now written in Sanscrit, though formerly in Prakrit. They worship twenty-four immortal saints, and deny the sacredness of caste. They are divided into two parties,—the Digambaras, the "sky-clad," and the Svetambaras, who are the "white-robed." Vardhamana and his immediate followers went naked; but the custom is now abandoned, although the idols in the Jain temples are still always naked. Their priests are celibates, and their widows are not allowed to remarry. The Jain temples and shrines are remarkable. The series of temples and shrines on Mount Abu is "one of the seven wonders of India," and presents most striking evidence of the wealth and importance of the sect. Some of their idols are enormous in height.

JAMES, the name of three important characters of the New Testament.

I. JAMES THE SON OF ZEDEDEE.—His mother, Salome, was a follower of Jesus (Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 41). He was the brother of John, and older than he, as is very probable from the fact that his name is almost always mentioned before John's (Matt. x. 2; Mark iii. 17, etc.). It is likely, though not certain, that he became a follower of Christ immediately after the baptism in the Jordan (John i. 32 sqq.). He and his brother were surnamed Boanerges, i.e., "sons of thunder" by Christ (Mark iii. 17). The reason for giving this designation is not recorded. He certainly did not intend an allusion to their eloquence, as the fathers supposed. The more probable view is, that the surname had reference to their passionate and vehement nature, both in thought and emotion, which sometimes showed itself in ambitious aspirations (Mark x. 5 sqq.) for a place of honor in the Messianic kingdom, but also in an ardent attachment to the person of Christ. James belonged, with John and Peter, to the narrower circle of Christ's more intimate disciples, was admitted into the chamber of Jairus' daughter (Mark v. 37), to the visions of the transfiguration (Mark ix. 2), and to the scene of the agony in Gethsemane (Matt. xxvi. 37). In the history of the early apostolic church nothing further is recorded of him than his death by the sword, under Herod Agrippa I. (Acts xii. 2). He was the first of the apostles to suffer martyrdom; and thus, in a more pronounced measure than in the case of John, the prediction of Christ was fulfilled in his experience, that the brothers should indeed drink of his cup, and be baptized with his baptism (Mark x. 39); and, at least in point of time, he received the second place of honor in the kingdom of heaven. Ecclesiastical tradition says that the accuser of James confessed Christ, and, after receiving the apostle's pardon, himself suffered martyrdom (Clem. Alex., in Euseb., H. E., ii. 9). The Church of Spain boasts that he shared in its foundation, but its tabular is in conflict with the statements of the New Testament.

II. JAMES THE SON OF ALPHAEUS, one of the twelve disciples of Jesus. He is so designated in four places.—Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13. No other passage can with certainty be regarded as referring to him or his family, and nothing further is known of him or his life. The alleged blood relationship of his family with the house of Jesus lacks all evidence. This hypothesis identifies his father Alpheus with
Clopas, and makes "Mary the wife of Clopas" (John xix. 25), a sister of Mary the mother of Jesus, or Clopas a brother of Joseph (Hegesippus). These suggestions are pure assumptions; for it is not at all certain that Μαρία ἡ γυνὴ Κλοπᾶς means the wife of Clopas. It may mean the mother, or the daughter, of Clopas. Nor has the identification of the name Alphæus with Clopas any thing in its favor. A further objection is, that this name would not be apt to have the same name, Mary. It is possible that he is the James whose mother is called Mary (Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xvi. 1), and who is styled "James the Less," and the brother of Joses (Mark xv. 40). The title "the Less" contained an allusion to his stature, and was not given to distinguish him from James the son of Zebedee (Meyer). But it is possible that another James is here mentioned, as we would rather expect the expression, "James the son of Alphæus." Of his further experiences we know nothing, except that, according to tradition, he labored in Egypt, where he suffered martyrdom by crucifixion, in the city of Otrakine (Niceph., ii. 40).

III. JAMES THE JUST, THE BROTHER OF THE LORD, the head of the Church at Jerusalem, is distinguished from the two apostles of the same name in Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3; Acta xii. 17, xv. 13, xxi. 18; 1 Cor. xv. 7; Gal. i. 10, ii. 9, 12; 1 Tim. 1. i.; Jude 1; and is mentioned by Josephus (Ant., XX. 9,1), Hegesippus (Eusebius: H. E., ii. 33), and the Church fathers. In the early Church the existence of our James as a distinct person was denied by some; he being identified with one of the two apostles of that name, and more generally with James the son of Alphæus. The fraternal relation reported to have existed between James and Jesus was explained as a relation between cousins. But Tertullian is a witness to the fact that the distinction between James and the apostles was still held in his day. He speaks of the consummation of Mary's marriage with Joseph after the birth of Jesus, and of the brethren of Jesus (De carne Christi, iv., adv. Hirt., x, 19), to prove the reality of the incarnation over against the Gnostic objections. At a somewhat later date the Apostolic Constitutions (ii. 55, vi. 12, 13) declare for the same view, when they mention as the representatives of Catholic doctrine the twelve apostles, Paul, and James the brother of the Lord, who is also placed among the seventy disciples. That a fraternal relation in some sense is vouched for by another passage (vii. 48): "I James, a brother of the Lord according to the flesh." The testimony of Eusebius is also very important. He clearly distinguishes James, the brother of the Lord, from the twelve apostles, places him among the seventy disciples, and counts fourteen apostles in all, Paul being the thirteenth, and James the fourteenth (Com. Jes. xvii. 5; H. E., i. 12, ii. 1, vii. 19); and the passage (H. E., i. 1) in which he speaks of him as the so-called "brother of the Lord does not refer to a more distant relationship, for he prepares the way for this expression by stating that Jesus was the son of Clopas, and avows the marriage between Mary and Joseph. Gradually the presumption of the perpetual virginity of Mary gained currency, and the fraternal relation of James was resolved into the relation of a step-brother. It is a matter of doubt whether this was done by Hegesippus, and in the pseudo-Clementine writings; but it is certain that there is not a trace in either of an identification of the brother of the Lord with an apostle. Hegesippus clearly makes this distinction (Euseb.: H. E., ii. 23). In the Prozevangelium Jacobi, which originated in Essene Christian circles, Joseph is represented as having been an aged man, surrounded with glory, and his espousal with Mary. It was only with hesitation that some learned Fathers, under the influence of a growing devotion to Mary, adopted this fable. The first trace of it occurs in Clement of Alexandria,—whom Origen followed, leaning upon Josephus,—when he speaks of only two men by this name,—the one thrown from a tower, the other executed with the sword (Euseb.: H. E., ii. 1). But the first to declare himself distinctly for this identification was Jerome, who wrote a work against Helvidius, advocating the doctrine of Mary's perpetual virginity. He speaks of the theory that James was a son of Joseph by a former marriage as an ungrounded fancy taken from the Apocrypha, and tries to prove that our James was the same as James the son of Alphæus by identifying Mary of John xix. 25 ("Mary the wife of Clopas"), the sister of Jesus' mother, with the wife of Alphæus. He seems afterwards to have renounced this theory; for in his Commentary on Isaiah (xvii. 6) he mentions fourteen apostles,—the twelve, James the brother of the Lord, and Paul. Augustine spoke of James as the son of Joseph by a former marriage, or as a relation of Mary. To the latter view he gave the preference.

These various views date from a time when all had their advocates among modern divines. The theory that James the Just was a son of Mary and Joseph, and is to be distinguished from the apostles, has been held by Herder, Stier, Credner, De Wette, Wieseler, Neander, Spalding, Huther, Weiss and Bleek, and some others (Bleek, Huther, and others; Stier and Wieseler, however, referring Acta xii. 17, xv. 13, xxi. 18, Gal. ii. 9—12 makes the son of Alphæus. Semler, Hug, Schnellenburger, Hofmann, Lange, and others identify our James with James the son of Alphæus.

The statements of the New Testament emphatically favor the first view. The expressions in Matt. i. 25 and Luke ii. 7 most naturally imply that the marriage between Joseph and Mary was consummated after Christ's birth; and the expression "first-born by nature" in other cases in the New Testament (Rom. viii. 29; Col. i. 15, 18; Heb. xi. 28; Rev. i. 5), indicates that other children were born to Mary. The subsequent close relation in which the so-called brothers of our Lord stand to Mary (Matt. xii. 47
JAMES.

JAMES, the epistle of, was written by James, a servant of Jesus Christ, and addressed to the Jews of the Dispersion (Jas. i. 1). The readers are the Jewish people as a whole, not in the foreign country of this world (Hofmann), but outside of Palestine, only in so far, however, as they recognize the authority of a servant of Jesus (comp. i. 18; ii. 1; v. 7). They are not all classes of Jews, Christian and non-Christian (Grotius, Credner, etc.), nor Christians without reference to birth and nationality (De Wette, Schwegler, Hilgenfeld), nor Jews both in and out of Palestine (Thiersch, Hofmann), but Jewish Christians of the Diaspora. They belonged not to a single district, but to foreign lands generally. There are no references to any personal relations between the writer and his readers; no greetings or requests, as in the Epistle to the Galatians, for example, which was addressed to a church.
one another (Baur, Schw格尔, Holtzmann, etc.); others, that there is a contrast between them which cannot be reconciled (Luther, Kern); while there are others still who hold that there is no direct antithesis between the two men, for James was writing for those who held the works of faith to be unnecessary. Paul, on the other hand, wrote to show the incompetency of the works of the natural man to justify. James agrees with Paul in his main point, that faith without corresponding works is insufficient (comp. 1 Cor. xii. 2; 2 Cor. v. 10).

There are indications that the Epistle was written at a comparatively late date in the apostolic period. Schneckenburger, Thiersch, Hofmann, Schaff, B. Weiss, Bleek, Beyschlag, [Alford, Plumptre, Lumby], and others hold to an earlier origin; and some regard it as the first of the New Testament writings. Their reasons do not seem to us sufficient. The late synagogues of 2 Macc. 12 are not a Jewish synagogue, but a place of Christian worship, controlled by Christians (ii. 3). The expectation of the second coming is also appealed to (v. 8 sqq.); but this expectation prevailed during the whole of the apostolic period. As the First Epistle of Peter seems to have made use of James, and itself was written in the year 65 or 66, we conclude that James was written a few years before.

The author designates himself as "James a servant of Jesus Christ." This was the brother of the Lord, who stood at the head of the Church at Jerusalem, and took such a prominent part in the council of Jerusalem (Acts xv.). Notices confirming the genuineness of the Epistle are not found till the close of the second century, and Origen is the first to quote him by name; but he did not regard the work as authentic. Eusebius also placed it among the antilegomena. In the Syrian Church, however, the Peshito version received it, and Ephraem quoted it. In the Latin Church, Jerome accepted it as canonical, and so, likewise, Augustine. This difference of opinion is to be regarded as due to the fact that James the brother of the Lord was not an apostle. (See preceding article.) But the whole tone, as well as the special injunctions, of the book, are in exact accord with the character of James as it is brought out in the New Testament and by Hege- sippus. He looked at the gospel in its legal aspect, and insisted upon righteousness of life. Both these features are prominent in the Epistle. The comparatively good Greek style of the composition is no argument against its genuineness; for Galilee in the first century was completely hellenized.

Lit. — The principal Commentaries on the Epistle of James are by Calvin, Beza [Richard Turnbull (London, 1606)], Herder (Briefe zweezer Bruder Jesu in unserm Kanon, 1775), Semler (1781), Rosenmüller (1787), Hottinger (1813), Schneckenburger (1832), Theile (Leipzig, 1839), Kern (Tübingen, 1850), Celler, A. (Geneva, 1859), Gessner-Wieringer (Königsberg, 1854), [Alford (London, 3d ed., 1864)], De Wette-Brückner (Leipzig, 3d ed., 1865), Lange and van Oosterzee (Bielefeld, 1866) [English translation by Momert, New York, 1867], Huther, in Meyer's Commentary (Göttingen, 3d ed., 1870), Plummer (Dort, 1869), Ewald (Götting, 1870), J. C. Van Vlissingen (Nördlingen, 1875), Bassett (London, 1876), Pendant, in Elliott's Commentary (London, 1878), D. Ermann (Berlin, 1881), Dean Scott in the Bible (Speaker's) Commentary (London and New York, 1882), Beyschlag, in the last edition of Meyer (Göttingen, 1882), Grogg, in Schaff's Commentary (New York and Edinburgh, 1883). See also Histories of the Apostolic Church, of Neander and Schaff, and art. of Lumby, in the Encyclopedia Britannica. SIEFFERT.

James, John Angell, an English Congregational pastor; b. at Blandford, June 6, 1786; d. at Birmingham, Oct. 1, 1859; educated in the theological academy conducted by Rev. David Bogue, D.D., at Gosport; ordained pastor of Carr's Lane Chapel at Birmingham, May 8, 1806, when barely twenty-one, and continued in that office till his death, over fifty years, Rev. R. W. Dale becoming his co-pastor in later years, and afterwards his biographer. Mr. James was a very laborious, earnest, and successful pastor, not remarkable for scholarship, but with fine talents for practical service, a good person and voice, a ready flow of language, and a constant aim at religious impression. As an author he is best known by The Anxious Enquirer after Salvation Directed and Encouraged, which has had so wide a circulation in Britain and America, and has been translated into several languages. But a collected edition of his works numbers fifteen volumes. They consist of sermons and addresses on practical subjects,—the ministry, the family, revivals, Christian graces, duties of young men, young women, and church-members. Mr. James cultivated a warm friendship with American ministers,—Dr. W. B. Sprague, Dr. S. H. Cox, Dr. C. G. Finney, and others,—and was a chief promoter of the formation of the Evangelical Alliance in 1846. See Dale: Life and Letters of John Angell James, Lond., 1862. F. H. MARLING.

Jameson (Anna Murphy), Mrs., b. in Dublin, May 19, 1797; married Robert Jameson, 1823, but soon after ceased to live with him; d. at Ealing, London, March 17, 1860. She is mentioned here because of her familiar Sacred and Legendary Art (London, 1848, 2 vols.), Legends of the Monastic Orders (1850), Legends of the Madonna (1852), History of our Lord and of his Precursor as represented in Art (vol. i. 1860, vol. ii. finished by Lady Eastlake, 1884). These works have all been republished in America.

Janes, Edmund Storer, D.D., LL.D., b. at Sheffield, Mass, April 27, 1807; d. in New-York City, Sept. 18, 1876. From 1824 to 1830 he taught school in New-York State and New Jersey, when he entered the Methodist ministry; in May, 1840, he was elected first president of the American Bible Society, and in 1844 resigned to accept the episcopate, having already impressed the whole church with his piety, eloquence, and wisdom. Henceforth for thirty-two years he was to be a wanderer over the earth, travelling longer distances, enduring longer absences from home, and performing more official work, than any of his colleagues. There was hardly a single suc-
cessful measure of his denomination which did not bear the trace of his wisdom in council, and the vigor of his hand in execution. He greatly excelled as a preacher. See his Life by Henry B. Ridgeway, D.D., New York, 1892.

**JANEWAY.**

Janeway, Matthias von, d. in Prague, Nov. 30, 1619, descended from a noble Bohemian family; studied theology in Prague and Paris, whence he was often called Magister Parisiensis; was appointed canon in the Cathedral of St. Vitus in 1681, and stands in the history of the Bohemian Church as one of the predecessors of Hus. He was not a great preacher, but exerted influence through his practical care of souls, and through his writings, treaties, which in 1392 he collected under the title *Regulae veteris et novi testamenti*. The principles of reform which he propagated were the abolition of any mere human addition to Christianity (doctrinal or ceremonial) and the return to the simple foundation on which rested the Apostolical Church. In 1433 Johann Rockycana asserted before the council of Basel that Janow used to administer the cup to the laity in the Lord’s Supper; but there is nothing in his writings which confirms that statement. See Jordan: *Die Vorläufer des Hussitenkunas in Böhmen*, Leipzig, 1846.

G. LECHLER.

**JANSENIUS.**

Jansenius, Cornelius, b. in the village of Aequoy, North Holland, Oct. 28, 1585; d. in Ypres, May 6, 1638. After completing his preliminary studies at Leerdam and Utrecht, he went to Louvain in 1602, and studied for a short time at the Jesuit college; but, becoming dissatisfied with the doctrines taught there, he removed to the College of Adrian VI., and came under the influence of Jacobus Jansenius, a follower of Michael Bajus, and a disciple of Augustine. Here he made the acquaintance of M. du Vergier de Hauranne, afterwards Abbé de St. Cyran. Having graduated in philosophy at Louvain in 1604, he went to Paris, and subsequently accompanied Du Vergier to Bayonne, where they remained together for six years, devoting themselves to the study of Augustine’s writings. Returning to Louvain in 1617, he declined the offer of a chair of philosophy, and was made director of the newly founded College of St. Pulcheria, which was completed, and its regulations instituted by him. He did not long retain this position, desiring to devote himself to theology. In 1619 he became doctor in that faculty. By incessant study of Augustine he became convinced that Catholic theologians had departed from the doctrine of the ancient Church. On a visit of St. Cyran to Louvain, in 1621, they divided their work for the reformation of the Church, Jansen taking the department of teaching, and St. Cyran that of organization. Intimate relations were formed with distinguished priests in Ireland. In 1623, and again in 1627, Jansen, deputed by the university, travelled to Spain in order to oppose the Jesuits, who had attempted to establish professorships of their own at Louvain. He was successful, the Jesuits in the Low Countries being ordered to continue to observe the restrictions which had been laid upon them in 1612. Notwithstanding their hostility, he was appointed in 1630 to the Regius Professorship of biblical exegesis at Louvain. In the same year he engaged in a controversy about Protestantism with Voetius, in which he was worsted. He secured the favor of the Spanish court by his opposition to France and its recent alliance with the Protestant Gustavus Adolphus. He also attacked the pretensions of France, in his pseudonymous work entitled *Alexandri Patrioci Armameni Theologiae et Argumentorum seu de Justitia Armorum et Federum Regis Galliae Libri Duo*. For this service to Spain he was rewarded with the bishopric of Ypres in 1636. Here he died of the plague two years after, just as he had completed his great work, the *Augustinus*, embodying the results of twenty-two years'
Jansenism. — The printing of the Augustinus was completed in 1640, notwithstanding the efforts of the Jesuits to suppress it. In 1641 the reading of it was prohibited by the Inquisition, and in 1643 by the bull In Eminente of Urban VIII. Though opposed in France and Belgium, the bull was finally accepted in 1651, not withstanding the efforts of the Jesuits to suppress it. The second part, in ten books, expounds Augustine's ideas concerning grace, and also the predestination of men and angels. The fundamental proposition of the work is, that, since Adam's fall, free agency no longer exists in man, pure works are a mere gratuitous gift of God, and the predestination of the elect is not an effect of his prescience of our works, but of his free will.

Other works of Jansen.—Oratio de Interioris Hominis Reformatione (1627); Alexipharmacum pro Civibus Silva Decomilus, adversus Ministrom Saurum Fancinum, etc. Responsio Breviss ad Libellum Eorum Provocatorum (Louvain, 1630); Spongia Notarum, quiobin Alexipharmacum aspirat (Geburts Voetius, Louvain, 1631); Tetrataeuchus, sive Commentarius in Quatuor Evangelia (Louvain, 1633); Pentateuchus, sive Commentarius in Quinque Libros Magnos (Louvain, 1641); Analecata in Proverbia, Ecclesiastes, Proverbs, Gen. 1 (Louvain, 1644).


Jansenism. — See Jansen. — The printing of the Augustinus was completed in 1640, notwithstanding the efforts of the Jesuits to suppress it. In 1641 the reading of it was prohibited by the Inquisition, and in 1643 by the bull In Eminenti of Urban VIII. Though opposed in France and Belgium, the bull was finally accepted in 1651, subscription not being insisted on, on a liberty which excludes constraint. (4) The Semi-Pelagians admitted the necessity of an inward prevenient grace for the performance of each particular act, and also for the first act of faith, and yet were heretical, since they maintained that this grace was of such a nature that the will of man was able either to resist or obey it. (5) It is Semi-Pelagian to say that Christ died, or shed his blood, for all men without exception.

In 1653 Innocent X., in the bull Cum Occasioni Impressiones Libri, pronounced the five propositions heretical. The Jansenists declared their readiness to condemn the propositions in the heretical sense, but not as the sense of Jansen. Therefore, in 1654, the Pope declared the condemned propositions to be in the Augustinus, and that their condemnation as the teaching of Jansen must be subscribed. Arnauld and the Port Royalists refused (see Port Royal), maintaining that the Pope's infallibility extended only to the doctrine of the faith, and not to a question of fact. He was expelled from the Sorbonne, and eighty others withdrew with him. The same year a general assembly of the clergy adopted a formula condemning the five propositions as contained in the Augustinus, and declaring that Jansen had perverted Augustine's meaning. A bull of Alexander VII., Oct. 16, indorsed the decision of the assembly. This document was sanctioned by the king in 1661, and the clergy, and all inmates of conventual establishments, were required to sign it on penalty of being treated as heretics. The leading Jansenists went into hiding, and the Port Royal nuns were imprisoned and cruelly treated. (See Port Royal.) Four bishops refused to subscribe to more than the promise of a "respectful silence" concerning the question of fact. At the solicitation of the king, the Pope named two archbishops and seven bishops as a tribunal to try the four, and with authority to suspend or excommunicate. Before they met, Alexander VII. died, and was succeeded by Clement IX. Nineteen bishops who had subscribed the condemnation now addressed the Pope on behalf of the four, asserting their orthodoxy. They followed by a letter to the king, declaring that the sentence of the four would be an invasion of the liberties of the Church, and would make the bishops no more than vicars of the Pope. In September, 1668, instructions came from Rome to make up with the four on any terms which would save the credit of the holy see. The result was the compromise known as "The Peace of Clement IX.", by which assent was not required to the declaration that Jansen had taught the five propositions in a purely heretical sense. This was a judicial defeat of the holy see. The conditions of the peace were kept secret. The quiet was of short duration. Louis XIV. was won over by the Jesuits. The old question of subscription was revived by M. Eustace, confessors of Port Royal, who threw into the form of a Case of Conscience the question whether one who condemned the incriminated doctrine of
Jansen, yet maintained a respectful silence as to the question of fact, could sign the formulæ
with a good conscience. A violent controversy
ensued, resulting in the bull of Clement XI. (1705), Vinea Domini, confirming and adding
all preceding condemnations of the five proposi-
tions. The refusal of the Port Royal nuns to
subscribe this bull was punished by the suppres-
sion of the convent in 1709, and the complete
destruction of the buildings in 1710. The demand
for an edition of Quenelle's Reflexions Morales
sur le Nouveau Testament stimulated the Jesuits
to secure its condemnation by the papal see. They
obtained an edict of Clement XI. in 1712, con-
demning it as a text-book of undisguised Jan-
senism. This was followed, in 1713, by the bull
Unigenitus, in which a hundred and one proposi-
tions from Quenelle's New Testament were con-
demned as Jansenistic. Upon this bull the French
Church divided into two parties. The king finally
decided that the bull should be binding on Church
and State. On the death of Louis XIV. the
Jansenists appealed to a general council, claim-
ing that the business is one for the Church, and not
in the grounds of Jansenism. They were called, therefore,
Appellants; their opponents, Acceptans. The Ap-
pellants were at last forced to submit. The bull was
formally registered in 1720 as the law of the
kingdom, with a reservation in favor of the liber-
ties of the Gallic Church. From this time for-
dward the Jansenists were rigorously repressed,
and during the eighteenth century Jansenism
degenerated in France. A temporary revival was
stirred up by the reports of miracles wrought in
the cemetery of St. Medard, in Paris, at the grave
of François de Paris, a Jansenist deacon of St.
Medard, and afterwards a recluse, who died in
1727. The spot became a shrine of pilgrimage,
and a scene of fanatical excesses, which weakened
the cause of Jansenism in intelligent minds. The
grave of François became the grave of Jansenism.
After the middle of the eighteenth century the
Jansenists ceased to attract public atten-
tion. Driven from France, they took refuge
in Holland, in Utrecht, and Haarlem, which re-
mained faithful to Rome when the rest of the
United Provinces embraced Calvinism on their
liberation from the Spanish yoke. In 1702 Peter
Coda, vicar of the chapter of Utrecht, was
suspended by Clement XI. for holding Jansen-
istic principles, and was detained at Rome for
three years, while Theodore de Cock, a Jesuit,
was appointed in his stead. The chapter of
Utrecht refused to acknowledge him, and joined
themselves with the Appellants. The govern-
ment of Holland, in 1708, suspended the papal
depot, and deposed Coda. Codde and his
friends in 1723 elected an archbishop, Cornelius
Steenhoven, for whom episcopal consecration was
obtained from Vorlet, a Jansenistic bishop. In
1742 Meindarts, Jansenist bishop of Utrecht, es-
tailed the bull Unigenitus; and at the bishopric of
Amiens, one of these ships, and there met Xavier, accom-
panying him to Goa, north of Calcutta, where he
embraced Christianity, was baptized, and educated
in the Jesuit College. In July, 1549, Xavier,
with Cosmo Torrez his principal assistant, Joan
Fernandez a layman, and "Brother Paul of the Holy
Faith" (Anjio), sailed from Goa, reaching
Shima (Shima, "the island," or Kiushiu), and

JANUARIUS, St. (San Genuaro), the patron
saint of the city of Naples, was bishop of Bene-
vento when the persecution of Diocletian broke
out, and was decapitated at Puteoli. His head
and two phials containing his blood are preserved
in a chapel of the cathedral of Naples, and ex-
hibited twice a year,—May 1 and Sept. 19.
When the phials are brought within sight of the
head, the blood becomes liquid, and begins to
bubble up; and this miracle, when happening
promptly and in a vigorous manner, is considered
a good omen for the city and people of Naples.
There are no less than thirteen other saints and
martyrs of the name Januarius, which at one
time was very common in Africa and Southern

JAPAN, Christianity in. No seeds of the reli-
gion of Jesus are known to have been planted in
Nihon until the arrival at Kagoshima, in Satsuma,
of Francis Xavier, in 1549. The "black ships"
of Europe, visited Japan as early as 1542, when a
lucrative commerce at once sprung up with
Portugal. Anjio, a Japanese refugee, assisted
by Mendez Pinto, in 1545 reached Macao, and
assisted in the building of a ship, and one of these ships, and there met Xavier, accom-
panying him to Goa, north of Calcutta, where he
embraced Christianity, was baptized, and educated
in the Jesuit College. In July, 1549, Xavier,
with Cosmo Torrez his principal assistant, Joan
Fernandez a layman, and "Brother Paul of the Holy
Faith" (Anjio), sailed from Goa, reaching
Shima (Shima, "the island," or Kiushiu), and
landing at Kagoshima Aug. 12. The first converts were the wife and relatives of Anjiro; and, after a year's stay, one hundred believers were numbered. Ordered to leave on account of the irritation of the daimio (feudal lord) of Satsuma at the conduct of the Portuguese merchants, the missionaries went to Hirado Island, making a hundred converts in a fortnight, and thence crossing over to Yamaguchi, in Nagato province. Meeting with the resistance here, they set out for Kioto, the miako, or capital. Owing to the chronic civil war, amounting almost to anarchy, which afflicted Japan during the middle of the sixteenth century, nothing could be done in Kioto. So, returning to Yamaguchi, Xavier presented his credentials, and, in place of a return in kind, received permission to preach in public, and, later, the gift of ground for a church and college. Within two months, five hundred converts were gathered, when Xavier (with his characteristic restlessness) went to Bungo province, and shortly after left Japan, dying on an island on the coast of China. In 1563, two new missionaries arrived, and Bungo became the centre of Christianity in Japan. In 1566 there were two thousand converts at Yamaguchi, when, a feud broken out, the church was burned, Torrez fled, and the church was for eighteen years without a pastor. In 1568 Villela visited Kioto and Sakai, securing two converts among the feudal nobility,—the holder of the fief of Omura, and one Arima no Kami. The violent excesses and ostentatious destruction of temples and idols practised by the former aroused the hostility of the Buddhist priests, who henceforward became the relentless foe of the new faith. Portugal sent new re-enforcements of Jesuit priests in 1600; but the civil war, and the bitter enmity of Mori (then lord of ten provinces), drove them from Kioto and Omura, and finally to Nagasaki. At this stage there were already many thousands of Christians.

We may have glance at the condition of Japan and the methods of propagation employed. Politically it was that period known in Japanese history as the epoch of civil war, when learning and the arts of peace were at a low ebb, and fighting was the chief pastime. The power of the mikado, or emperor, was a mere shadow. The family of the Ashikaga shOguns, or military regents (1335—1578), had so decayed that their dignity was nominal; so that the country was paralysed among the feudal barons, or daimios, all jealous of, and fighting with, each other. Eager for the advantages of foreign trade, the daimios of Kiushiu especially favored the missionaries, and in several instances compelled their subjects to become Christians by proclamations; the alternative being banishment, or confiscation of goods.

Religiously, Japan was ripe for a new faith. Shinto, the indigenous cult, had been so overlaid by Buddhism, that it had fallen away into a mere matter of archaeology for the scholar, and mythology for the people.

On the other hand, the peasantry, reduced to poverty and misery by centuries of war, found little comfort in the faith of India. The simple tenets of Shaka had swollen to a sensuous system of worship and of commercial prayers and masses. Except the gorgeous magnificence of altars and temples, and the plethora of monasteries and boxes, there was little to show of vitality in Buddhism. Further, the monks were really a clerical militia, capable of equipping and leading to battle whole armies of adherents, both in tonsure and top-knot, and were thus an organized and dangerous political power.

At such a time, and among such an imaginative people as the Japanese, the Portuguese Jesuits landed. With crucifix and painting, medal and cross, vestment, incense, lights, altars, and abundant gold, they outdazzled the scenic displays of the Buddhists. With eloquence, fervor, and devotion, with their new doctrines and morality, they won thousands of enthusiastic converts.

In Nobunaga, the haer and crushing persecutor of the Buddhists, who had also deposed Ashikaga, and wished to unify all Japan for the mikado, missionaries found a friend who needed a counterpoise to the bonzes. Organtin, under his protection, labored in Kioto from 1568 to 1578. In 1592 the three Christian nobles sent a mission to the Holy See. In company with Valignani, they reached Rome, making a lengthened stay in Europe; but in the year of their return, in 1585, Nobunaga their friend was assassinated. Hideyoshi (Fuxiba), his successor, though from the first opposed to Christianity, masked his policy, since his prime necessity was to win the friendship of the southern daimios, among whom were the Christian nobles and gentry, in order to bring them to his side and under his control. Colleges were planted at Osaka and Sakai; churches were built in many provinces; and the illustrious converts, Kuroda (Don Rondera) and Konishi (Don Austin) professed their faith.

In 1587 Hideyoshi, unmasking his purpose, ordered all the foreign priests to procure to Hirado, and leave the country. The measure not being urged, they left Hirado, and, under the protection of the Christian princes, pursued their work in private. Organtin and Rodriguez returned to Kioto; and in 1591 Martizan, the first bishop of Japan, arrived. Three thousand Japanese were baptized between 1587 and 1590, and the literary activity in the interest of the propaganda went on.

Hitherto the only foreigners in Japan were Portuguese, and the only phase of Christianity Jesuitism. In 1580, in an embassy sent from the governor of the Philippine Islands, were four Franciscan friars, who trespassed on the Jesuits' ground, on the plea that they came as attachés to the embassy. By the bull of Pope Gregory XIII., dated Jan. 28, 1585 (confirmed by Clement III. in 1600), Japan had been assigned exclusively to the Jesuits. The Franciscans, violating their promise made to the Japanese ruler, not to preach, began to do that very thing, thereby rousing the wrath of a man who was never trifled with.

Hideyoshi having reduced all Japan to unity, and been made koumbaku, or regent, had now to face the double problem of finding employment for a host of warriors bred to arms from infancy, and of ridding Japan of a foreign priesthood whom he suspected of political designs. On a frivolous pretext he declared war against Onna, and in 1592 sent an army of a hundred and fifty thousand men, composed largely of converts, led
Baptiste Sidotti, an Italian priest, reached Japan with some gray-headed prisoners. In 1709 Jean by way of Manila, but was at once seized, and by Christiangenerals, to invade that country, except Dutch and Chinese. Fire and sword were used to annihilate Christianity, and to paganize the people. Trampling on the crucifix became the sign and proof of apostasy. Thousands of native Christians fled to China, Formosa, and the Philippines; and in 1837 thousands more rose in armed rebellion, and, seizing an old castle at Shimabara in Kiushiu, resisted for two months the assaults of the government troops. Once captured, the thirty-seven thousand Christians were given over to massacre, and drowning in the sea. After this, persecution, inquisition, and torture went on so successfully, that, when the eighteenth century opened, there were no known believers in “the Jesus doctrine” in Japan, except some gray-headed prisoners. In 1709 Jean Baptiste Sidotti, an Italian priest, reached Japan by way of Manila, but was at once seized, brought before the Inquisition at Yedo, and imprisoned until his death. In 1829 several Christians were seized at Osaka, and were kept on the suspicion of communicating with foreigners. In spite of two centuries and a half of vigilant repression and supposed extirpation, the roots of the faith still kept their vitality.

When, after long isolation from the rest of the world, Japan was opened to foreign trade and residence, in 1859, the three great branches of the Christian Church at once sent their missionaries into the field at Nagasaki, Kanagawa, or Hakodate. The Roman Catholics had the advantage of historic continuity in their labors; for, almost as soon as they landed, they found in the villages near Nagasaki thousands of believers, descendants of the martyrs of the seventeenth century, still secretly practising their faith. At intervals, however, until 1872, when the government ceased persecution, many of these Christians were seized, imprisoned, and exiled among the northern provinces. Statistics of Roman Catholicism in Japan are not easily accessible.

“The Holy Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic Church” of Russia has a mission whose imposing buildings are in Tokio; and its founder, the archimandrite Nicolai, with his assistants, has trained up a large native ministry, whose following numbers several thousands. Protestant missionary operations were also begun in 1859 by the London Missionary Society and four American churches—Reformed (Dutch), Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Baptist—at Nagasaki and Kanagawa. Owing to the jealous hostility of the government, no disciples, except those “who came by night,” were made for ten years. Profession of the outlawed religion was at risk of life or limb. Meanwhile the mastery of the language, and the work of healing, teaching, and translation, went on. The first Protestant Christian Church was organized at Yokohama, on the Perry treaty-ground, in 1872, by the Rev. James Ballagh of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America; and the fourth, in Tokio, the capital, in 1873, in which year the anti-Christian edicts were removed. The Reformed churches holding the presbyterian order formed themselves into an alliance for mutual help; other native bodies of believers were organized on an independent basis. In Great Britain and the United States increasing interest was manifested in this most promising missionary field; and all the important evangelical bodies soon had representatives at one of the open ports, which, since 1868, have been Nagasaki, Yokohama, Hiogo, Hakodate, Niigata, besides Tokio. Since 1874, Christians have organized churches, and worshipped unmolested in many places in the interior; and now every large island has flourishing churches of the Protestant, Roman, and Greek communions. The methods of propagation used by the brethren of the Mission Apostolique of Paris are in the main those of Papal Christianity everywhere, and not differing greatly from those of the sixteenth century in Japan. They claim a following of many thousands. The mission of the Holy Synod of Russia makes liberal use of Protestant versions of the Holy Bible, but is otherwise rigidly faithful to traditional mediaevalism. All Christian bodies make use of the press, secular and reli-
gious schools. The literary opposition is in general not very severe, nor of a character to inspire respect for the Japanese intellect. The vigorous native newspapers may be said to be as friendly as hostile. Buddhist priests and rabid patriots are the chief opponents; and the products of the infidel writers and lecturers of Christendom are diligently translated into Japanese.

The statistics of the work of Protestant evangelicals for the year 1881 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Date of arrival</th>
<th>Missionaries</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Baptised converts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformed Church in America</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Protestant Episcopal Church</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Baptist Church</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Board C. F. M. (Congregational)</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Japanese) Church Missionary Society</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Methodist Episcopal Church</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Methodist Church</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(English) Society for the Propagation of the Gospel</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Medical Mission</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Presbyterian Church of Scotland</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Baptist Church</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformatted Church of the United States</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant Methodist Church</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Native Churches</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian-Greek</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of all Protestant societies and churches, 3,811.

The Bible societies—American, National (Scotland), and British and Foreign—have agents, who in 1881 disposed (by sale only) of eighteen million printed pages of the Bible (in whole, or in parts), at sixteen thousand dollars; one society reporting an increase of business, in one year, of a hundred per cent. Two tract societies—the American and London Religious—disposed of a hundred and twenty thousand books and tracts, or two and a half million pages. The Japanese Christian associations and native religious press help in diffusing Christian leaven. A high moral standard of character is insisted upon by all the Protestant churches; and in no other respect, except in the constant use of the Holy Scriptures in the vernacular, does the Reformed Christianity of to-day differ more from that known during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Japan. The influences of the religion of Jesus are penetrating deeply into the social life of the people, and rooting themselves in heart and intellect alike. Undoubtedly the way has been prepared and made smooth for the rapid success of missionary operations by the wondrous assimilation of modern civilization by the Japanese. By a series of political movements, which began during the century preceding the arrival of Commodore Perry and which culminated in the revolution of 1868 (which destroyed the duarchy of which Yedo with the "tycoon," and Kioto with the mikado were foci), the nation was prepared to adopt the civilization to which Chrisendom has given birth, and which it has nourished. The government of the mikado, when restored to supreme authority in Tokio, in 1868, at first persecuted, but later, under pressure of diplomacy at home, and of shame in Europe, abandoned coercion in religious matters, suffered Shinto to fall into abeyance, and, nominally at least, granted toleration. Now, in friendly rivalry, the national common school and the missionary educational systems flourish together, male and female in both having equal privileges. There also prevails increasingly among the people of Japan the belief that righteousness exalts a nation, and that pure religion and morals, such as Christianity offers and demands, furnish the surest ground of progress and national longevity. Licentiousness, intemperance, and lying are the moral cancers of the national character; but the ideals of Jesus, once grafted upon the affectionate, filial, loyal, courteous spirit of the Japanese, will heal the scars of sin, and produce one of the noblest types of redeemed humanity.

Not the least tokens of the zeal and consecration which characterize Protestant missionaries in Japan are the fruits of their laborious scholarship. The various translations, grammar, and phrase-book of the Rev. S. R. Brown, D.D., the superb dictionaries of J. C. Hepburn, M.D., the linguistic helps, scholarly and religious works, of Imbrir, Amerman, Stout, Knox, Eby, N. Brown, and others, have not only shed lustre upon American scholarship, but have greatly enriched native and foreign Christian literature, especially the former. The medical, literary, and pedagogic work of others have borne fruit in a mighty harvest of good to the nation at large. Like some of the enormous blocks of stones that form the foundation-wall of their fortresses, defying war, time, and earthquake-shock, are the works of Christian missionaries in the edifice of Japan's new civilization.
JARVIS. Samuel Farmer, D.D., LL.D., historiographer to the Episcopal Church in the United States of America; b. at Middletown, Conn., Jan. 20, 1786; d. there March 26, 1851. He was graduated at Yale College 1805; entered the ministry of the Episcopal Church 1810; was minister in New-York City until 1818; from 1820 to 1828 was missionary in Upper Canada and Illinois; from 1838 to 1842 minister in Middletown, Conn.; and in 1843, historian. He published A Chronological Introduction to the History of the Church, London and New York, 1844; The Church of the Redeemed, or the History of the Mediatorial Kingdom, vol. i. (all published), Boston, 1850.

JASHER, Book of. The volume itself has perished; but two allusions to it are found in the Bible,—Josh. x. 13 and 2 Sam. i. 18. The word "Yashar" (Jasher) occurs eight times; and therefore the title is probably a description of the book's contents,—a collection of lyrics setting forth the glorious deeds of the nation's heroes. We have no knowledge when the collection was made, nor how much ground it covered; yet interest in this lost book has been excited by our very ignorance, and conjecture has been rife. There have also been several books written which pretended to be the Book of Jasher, or, at all events, bore this title. Three of these are of Jewish origin. One is a moral treatise, written in A.D. 1394 by Rabbi Oyrene, a Hellenistic Jew, who shortly before the destruction of the temple, the wars against Antiochus Epiphanes and Eupator, the restoration of the law, and the liberation of the Holy City (175-160 B.C.). The work was in five books, but the original has perished. The present Second Book of the Maccabees, however, is an extract from it (2 Macc. ii. 19).—II. Jason, brother of the high priest Onias III, who, from sheer personal ambition, forgot his religion and fatherland so far as to buy the dignity of high priest for a considerable sum of money from Antiochus Epiphanes, and then prostitute the office for the purpose of introducing Hellenism among his countrymen, and despoiling them of their old national liberties (2 Macc. iv. 7; comp. 1 Macc. i. 13). His own name he changed from Jesus into Jason (Josephus: Antiq. XII. 5, 1). Under the castle in Jerusalem he established a gymnasium for the propagation of Hellenic culture. To the games at Tyre in honor of Hercules he sent ambassadors with presents, and Antiochus he received in the Holy City with great magnificence (2 Macc. iv. 22). But after the lapse of three years, in 172 or 171 B.C., he wassupplanted in the favor of the king by a certain Menelaos, a brother of the Benjamite Simon (2 Macc. iv. 23). The forgery owes its origin to the high-priestly office, and Jason was compelled to fly to the Ammonites. Soon after, however, when a rumor arose that Antiochus had perished on an expedition against Egypt, Jason returned, at the head of one thousand men, laid siege to Jerusalem, and conquered the city, with the exception of the castle. He took a bloody revenge on his enemies, but was in the long-run unable to maintain himself. Once more he fled to the Ammonites; and afterwards, pursued by the Arabian King Aretas, he wandered about from place to place, until he finally perished miserably in Sparta (2 Macc. v. 6). Josephus, however, gives quite another account of his life and character (Antiq., XII. 5, 1; XX. 10, 3). According to that report, he succeeded his brother Onias III. in a legitimate way, but was himself expelled by a younger brother, Menelaos; and it was Menelaos, and not Jason, who labored to propagate Hellenism among the Jews. But we have no means to decide between the two accounts. See Schürer: Neutest. Zeitgeschichte, p. 74.—IV. Jason, a Christian, in whose house Paul lived in Thessalonica (Acts xvii. 5-9). Whether he was identical with the Jason mentioned in Rom. xvi. 21 as a relative of Paul is not known.

JAUFFRET, Gaspard Jean André Joseph; b. at La Roque-Bruissane, Provence, Dec. 13, 1759; d. in Paris, May 13, 1823; studied at Toulon, Aix, and Paris; founded in 1791 the Annales de la Religion; became in 1801 attached to Cardinal Fesch as private secretary and vicar-general, and was appointed bishop of Metz in 1806 and bishop of Aix in 1811. Many congregations of monks and nuns, both in Paris and in his dioceses, owe their re-organization to him. His principal writings are, De la Religion à l'Assemblée Nationale, 1791, and Du Culte Public, 1785.
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JEANNE D'ALBRET.

father of Elishah, Tarshish, Kittim, and Doda-
nim. The cuneiform inscriptions of Assyria con-
tain the same notices. The Hindoos also call
the people of the farthest West Javena (jeen
"young"), because the Western nations were the
youngest branches of the Indo-semantic races.

There was also a city of Javan in Arabia, alluded
to in Ezek. xxvii. 18. [See B. Stade: De Popu-
lo Javan parergon patrio sermo concrption, Gies-
 sen, 1880, 20 pp.]

JAY, William, an English clergyman, for near-
ly sixty-two years pastor of the Congregational
Church at Argyle Chapel, Bath, Somersetshire;
b. at Tisbury, Wiltshire, May 6, 1789; d. at Bath,
Dec. 27, 1853; educated by Cornelius Winter at
the dissenting academy at Marlborough. Began
to preach at sixteen, and in 1788 became preac-
er at a small church at Churham Malford, near Chip-
penham; thence he removed to Hope Chapel,
Clifton, in 1798, and was ordained pastor at Bath,
Jan. 30, 1791. Jay's preaching attracted hearers
of all classes. John Foster said he was the
"Prince of Preachers." Sheridan declared him
to be the most manly orator he had ever heard.
His published sermons have been widely circu-
lated. His chief works are, An Essay on Mar-
rriage, Memoirs of the Rev. Cornelius Winter,
Memoirs of the Rev. John Clark, Lectures on Female
Scripture Characters. His Morning and Evening
Exercises (4 vols.) have been very popular. His
Autobiography, with a supplement by Bedford
and J. A. James, was published in 1844. His
ministry was distinguished by its directness, sim-
plicity, scriptural and evangelical character, and
was attended and maintained with marked suc-
cess.

JEALOUSY, The Trial of, is clearly and mi-
nutely described in Num. v. 11-31; but, as Jew-
ish tradition modified and interpreted the legal
statements, the following explanations will be of
interest. "The tenth part of an ephah of barley-
meal"—the "offering of jealousy, an offering of
memorial, bringing iniquity to remembrance,"
because it had the object of bringing the wife's
guilt before God, so that he might uncover it—
(v. 15) was an offering of the suspected wife, and
taken out of her hand (v. 25); yet, since wives
had no personal property, it really came from him,
and very appropriately too, since he instigated the
trial, without the assent of his wife. It was a
bloodless offering, because in no case was there in
it any atonement; yet it was necessary, because
no one dare appear empty before Jehovah (Exod.
xxiii. 15, xxxiv. 20). It introduced the pro-
cedings, and, as far as the wife was concerned, had
no prejudicial value: it merely signified that she
was suspected, not condemned, and consisted
of barley, the food of the poor and of cattle, to
indicate this suspicion; and, lastly, it was prepared
without oil or frankincense, so that it might have
no sweet-smelling savor. The woman's head was
uncovered, and her hair unloosed, to indicate her
culpability, Scriptural and evangelical character,
and thereby increased the
strength of the drink. It was the water which
wrought the curse (cf. Ps. cix. 18). The under-
lying idea was, that God dwelt in the midst of his
people, and would come, according to his promise,
and render efficacious his own appointed ordi-
nances. In the form of a test, the woman was to
lay the punishment of the adulteress; and there-
fore the convict was not liable to the punishment
for adultery enjoined in Lev. xx. 10, Deut. xxii.
22.

The Talmudic tract Sota (i.e., the dissolve
wife) adds certain particulars to the Bible account.
Before the trial of jealousy, warning must have
been given by the husband. This being disregard-
ed, the wife was taken before the local authorities,
and then before the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem. By
the latter she was kindly but warningly exhorted
to confession. If she confessed, then her marriage-
certificate was destroyed, and she lost all claim
upon her husband's property, but was otherwise
unpunished. If she refused to confess, she was
taken to the Nicanor Gate of the temple, which
was between the Court of Israel and the Court
of the Women, and there the solemn rites were per-
formed. Her veil and her ornaments were re-
moved, she was dressed in black garments, given
the waters of jealousy to drink, and then the meal
was thrown upon the altar. If innocent, she suf-
fared no harm: if guilty, she felt its disastrous
effects. These traditional ceremonies were de-
signed to lessen the number of trial-cases, and
certain whole classes of women were debarred
ever drinking the waters of jealousy; e.g., those
who by nature or age were incapable of bearing
children. Moreover it was decided, that, if the
jealous husband had himself been unchaste, the
waters would have no effect; and so in other cases.
Again: the good conduct of the woman, especially
her zeal in teaching and practising the law, de-
barred such a trial for a certain length of time,
even as long as three years. The school of Hillel
abolished it entirely.

(J) It is important to observe the striking dif-
ference between the divine test of conjugal fidelity
and human tests. In the former case the innocent
woman certainly escaped, since there was really
nothing given her but a little pure water and a
few pinches of dust. But in the ordeals of the
middle age, and among heathen nations, the result
of the test was certain to be either death or great
suffering, entirely irrespective of the moral status
of the suspected wife. See Wagenseil: Sota,
hoc est liber Mischnicus de uzore adulterii suspecta,
Aldorf, 1674; see also Franz Delitzsche's art.
Eiferpfer, in Riehm's Handbuch d. bib. Alter-
thums.

JEANNE D'ALBRET, Queen of Navarre,
mother of Henry IV., of France, and the faithful
friend of French Protestantism; b. in Pau, Jan.
7, 1528; d. in Paris, June 9, 1572. She was the
eldest child of Henry d'Albret, King of Navarre,
and Margaret d'Angoulême-Alençon, sister of
Francis I. of France. By the death of her only
brother she became in 1530 heir-presumptive of
the kingdom Navarre-Béarn, which, though small
in area, attained a large importance by its stra-
gic location on the boundary between France and
Spain. Jeanne was a feeble child, but possessed
a clear and discerning mind, strong will, indomi-
table energy, and an unusual aptitude for diplo
macy. In 1548 she was married to the Duke Antoine de Bourbon Vendome, a man of elegant manners and prodigal habits. Their third child, Jeanne, afterwards became Henry IV. of France. In 1555 the kingdom of Navarre, by the death of her father, passed into her hands. This princess played a very prominent part in the Protestant Reformation of France. She had breathed the atmosphere of the new religious movement at the court of her mother, and in subsequent bold advocacy of Protestantism won for her the title of the "Deborah of the Huguenots." Upon the death of her husband, in 1562, who had assumed an unfavorable attitude towards Protestantism, she began in earnest the introduction of the Reformation in her realm. The New Testament was translated by John de Liçarrague de Briscours, and published at Rochelle, 1571, under the title, Jesus Christus Goura Jeanaren Testamento. Barthe, and a church discipline (Discipline duc du pays de Béarn) was drawn up after the model of the Genevan, by Raymond Merlin. In 1568 an army invaded her territory; but, warned beforehand, she made good her escape to La Rochelle, the common refuge of the Huguenots. During the troublous period that followed, down to the time of her death, she manifested the most ardent attachment to the cause of the Reformation. She remained at Rochelle three years; and her name and that of her son appear at the head of the list of those who were present at the third general synod of the Reformed Church held in that city. She died of a fever, at Paris, whither she had gone to make preparations for the marriage of her son with Margaret of Valois.

Jeanne contributed much to the cause of the Protestant in France. She is a representative type of the Huguenot.—full of faith, and animated by lofty purposes and indomitable courage. She will always remain one of the foremost figures of French Protestantism, and one of the noblest queens of the century.


JEHUBUS (Gen. xxv. 14; Josh. xiv. 12); JEBOUSITES (dry place, or trodden-down place, i.e., perhaps, for a threshing-floor). The Jebusites was a Canaanitic tribe (Gen. xvi. 13), belonging to the Amoritic branch (Josh. x. 5). They are always mentioned last among the Canaanites (Gen. xv. 21; Josh. ix. 2, xxiv. 11), probably because they formed only a small tribe.

But they were brave. When the Israelites entered the promised land, the Jebusites occupied the southern part of the mountains of Judah, and were called, after their chief stronghold, Jebus, the later Jerusalem (Josh. xi. 3, xviii. 28). Their land was allotted to Benjamin; but Jebus, or Jebusi, successfully resisted Joshua and later sieges, and was conquered only by David (2 Sam. v. 6; 1 Chron. xi. 4), who made it his capital, as it had been that of the Canaanites; and it remained the seat of a powerful city-state of its own until the rise of the Crusades; probably so early as the time of Abraham, if, as is likely, it was identical with the Salem of Gen. xiv. 18. It was at that time very small, covering only the hill of Zion. It owed its strength simply to its situation. In the division of the land, Jebus fell to Benjamin (Josh. xvii. 28).

JEHO'ACHIN (whom Jehovah has appointed), the son and successor of Jehoiakim; king of Judah (2 Kings xxiv. 8–10). He reigned only three months and ten days; for Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem, carried him and ten thousand captives, including the nobles and artisans, to Babylon, and he remained in captivity thirty-seven years, until Evil-merodach released him, and put him at the head of all the captive kings (Jer. lii. 31–34).

JEHOY'ADA (whom Jehovah knows), high priest, and husband of Jehosheba, the aunt of Josiah, who alone of the family of Ahaziah escaped the murderous hand of Athaliah (2 Kings xi. 1–xii. 2). Jehoiada was the guardian of the young king, put him upon the throne, killed Athaliah, and, so long as he lived, so wisely directed Josiah that all things went well. In recognition of his eminent services to Church and State he was buried "in the city of David, among the kings" (2 Chron. xxiv. 16). The chronicler states his age at death to have been a hundred and thirty years.

JEHOV'AKIM (whom Jehovah sets up), the eldest son of Josiah, and the brother and successor of Jehoahaz upon the throne of Judah. He reigned wickedly for eleven years, when he was killed or murdered, and "buried with the burial of an ass, drawn, and cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem" (Jer. lii. 31). His original name was Eliakim (2 Kings xxiii. 34); but, when he saw his elevation in his twenty-fifth year to Pharaoh-nechoh, whose tributary he became. But after four years he was defeated by Nebuchadnezzar, and compelled to pay tribute to him. After three years he rebelled, was taken prisoner, but ultimately released, and allowed to reign as a vassal. It was he who murdered the prophet Urijah (Jer. xxvi. 23), and so impiously cut up and burnt Jeremiah's roll of prophecies (Jer. xxvi. 28). His history is given briefly in 2 Kings xxiii. 34–xxiv. 6 and 2 Chron. xxxvi. 4–8; but many details are supplied by Jer. xxiii. 13–19, xxvi., xxxvi.

JEHO'RAM or JO'RAM (whom Jehovah has exalted), the name of two kings. I. The eldest son of Jehoshaphat, and his successor, as king of Judah, B.C. 892–885. His history is given in 2 Kings xxii. 50, 2 Kings viii. 16–24, 2 Chron. xxxii. 8. His wife was Athalith, daughter of Ahaz and Jezebel; and under her banished influence he slew his brothers on coming to the throne, and led a bad life, full of misfortunes for himself and his kingdom, until a terrible disease of the bowels terminated his career, after two years of
bodily suffering. He died unwept, unsung; and, although buried in the city of David, it was not in the sepulchres of the kings. To him Elijah sent a warning letter, foretelling his end. Under him the Edomites and Libnah successfully revolted.

II. The son of Ahab and Jezebel, and therefore brother-in-law to the preceding; king of Israel, B.C. 896-884. His history is given in 2 Kings vii. 17, viii. 5—8; viii. 24. He was weak, rather than positively bad; although he followed the traditions of his house in the Baal worship. With Jehoshaphat he contracted friendship, and seems also to have been liked by Elisha. For his union with the former in war upon Moab, see Jehoshaphat. Elisha acted as his counsellor in his war with Syria, revealing prophetically the plans of the foe; but subsequently, when Benhadad besieged Samaria, and produced a grievous famine in the city, Jehoram laid the blame upon Elisha, and sought to kill him. The prophet, however, foretold the plenty which would follow, and the king's friendship returned. When Hazael revolted in Damascus, in consequence of Elisha's prediction (2 Kings vii. 12), Jehoram attempted, by the help of Ahaziah, king of Judah (his nephew), to take Ramoth-gilead from the Syrians, thinking to profit by the confusion of that kingdom. The project failed, and Jehoram went to Jezreel to recover from his wounds. When thus invalided, Jehu rebelled against him, in obedience to the Lord's order (2 Kings ix. 6), attacked him in Jezreel, met him in his chariot, and shot him through the heart with an arrow on the plat of ground which Ahab had wrested from Naboth the Jezreelite. And thus Elijah's prophecy was literally fulfilled (1 Kings xxii. 17-29). Jehoram was the last king of the dynasty of Omri.

JEHOASHAPAT (Jehovah does justice), the son and successor of Asa; King of Judah for twenty-five years, - 914-889 B.C., according to the common reckoning. The sources of his history are 1 Kings xxii. 41-50; 2 Chron. xvii.—xxi. 1. He succeeded in raising Judah to a situation which he had not occupied since Solomon, and thus made it appear very desirable to Ahab to add him as an ally against Syria. The proposition was received with only too great readiness on Jehoshaphat's part; and the brother-kings fought against Syria at Ramoth-gilead, notwithstanding the solemn warning of the Jehovah prophet Micaiah. For this conduct he was reproved by Jehu on his return. At the same time, as a sequel to this, the Ammonites and Moabites attacked Judah. The intelligence was received with great apprehension, but laid before the Lord in prayer by the king. In answer, Jahaziel, a Levite, was inspired to announce that the Lord would fight for them on the morrow: so upon that day Judah went out preceded by singers, and found that their enemies had turned their swords against one another, and fled in great confusion. Again: still later, Jehoshaphat showed his weakness by joining Jehoram, the son of Ahab, in an expedition against Moab. Elisha accompanied them, and by this interposition averting a water-famine (2 Kings iii. 16-20). He told them to dig trenches, which, when filled with the water which Jehovah sent, seemed to run with blood when the sun shone upon them. Thus the Moabites were deceived to their destruction as they came up to the camp of Israel, supposing that they had smitten one another, and were themselves slain. The king of Moab, Mesha, straitly besieged in Kir-haraseth, offered up his eldest son upon the wall. "And there was great indignation against Israel; and they departed from him, and returned to their own land." These mysterious words imply some sort of a panic. A third co-operation with Israel was with Ahaziah on an unfortunate commercial enterprise.

But the greatness of Jehoshaphat was certainly not displayed in his wars, but in his government. He was a pious king, and ruled in the fear of the Lord; yet the high places were not removed, and the amount of permanent good he did was small, not through any fault of his, however. In his zeal he sent five of his princes—nine Levites and two priests—to teach in all the cities of Judah the law of the Lord (2 Chron. xvii. 7-9). He also arranged a system of appellate jurisdiction, culminating in Jerusalem (2 Chron. xix. 6—11). A third priest judged in the capital. A fourth priest judged in the provincial towns. It was no wonder that Jehoshaphat waxed great exceedingly, and that the land rejoiced in its prosperity (2 Chron. xvii. 12 sqq.). But Jehoram, the son of this pious and prosperous king, married the daughter of Ahab, and reigned wickedly; so that the kingdom rapidly lost position.

LIT. - Besides the Commentaries, see especially the Bible Histories of Ewald and Hitziq; upon Meshal, see the art. MOAB.

JEHOVAH, יְהוָה [Jhv], is the name of God which is characteristic of and peculiar to the Old Testament, and for that reason called by the Jews the peculiar name (יְהוָה יִי, יְהוָה יִי), and the name which does not express an attribute of God, like Elohim, but his whole being.

I. Pronunciation and Etymology. - The tetragrammaton יְהוָה was not pronounced by the Jews, and the Masoretes gave it to the vowel-points of another divine name, יְהוָה (Adonai); but, where these two names occur side by side, they gave to it the vowels of Elohim (Isa. xxii. 12, 14, etc.). The Jews based the prohibition of the pronunciation of the name on Lev. xxiv. 16, where the translation "blaspheme" is proper; but the LXX. translated it "naming the name of the Lord" (ὀνομαζοντης τον θεον). The first trace of the feeling which shunned the pronunciation of the name is found in some of the later books of the Old Testament, which use the name Jhv: comparatively seldom; and in the LXX., which always translates it by Lord (στους). Josephus says he was not allowed to utter the name (Ant. xi. 12, 4), and Philo relates that it was heard and uttered in the Holy of holies (Vit. Mis., iii. 11). The Mishna, Barachoth (ix. 5) says, in commenting upon Ruth ii. 4, Judg. ii. 16, that its use was permitted in greetings. Abba Schaul (Sanhedrin x. 1), on the other hand, includes amongst those who have no part in the future life all who pronounce the divine name as it is written. According to the Talmud, however, the name might only be uttered in the temple by the priest in pronouncing the blessing, and by the high priest on the day of atonement; but even this privilege was taken away after the death of
Simeon. Among the Jews the opinion prevailed, that the knowledge of how the name was pronounced was lost at the destruction of Jerusalem; but many Christian theologians (Gataker, Leusden, etc.) have held that Jehovah (יהוה) is the original pronunciation. The data for the determination of the pronunciation and the etymology are found in Exod. iii. 14. There the name of God is revealed to Moses as בם יְהוָה ("I AM THAT I AM")... יְהוָה (I AM) "hath sent me to you." This makes it clear that יוהו ([Jhv]) is formed from the third person of the imperfect of יהוה ([Havah]), an older form of יהוה, and is to be pronounced either יהוה (Yahweh) or יהוה (Yahveh), from יוהו, which is the more natural and rhythmical. According to Theodore, the Samaritans read the name, יוהו ([Jabez]); the Jews, יוהו ([Jehu]); according to Clement of Alexandria, יוהו (Youn); the first and the last, perhaps, point to the use of יוהו (Jahu) as a name for God in common conversation.

II. Meaning. — According to Exod. iii. 14, the meaning of יוהו is He, that is who he is. But, as the verb originally signifies to become, the name signifies that He is a progressive manifestation of God, which he is to man in history. The heathen regarded the revelation of their gods almost exclusively as a thing of the past; but this name shows that God was revealing himself constantly and progressively: in other words, it witnessed to the Hebrew people that their God was a God of the future. The word distinctly expresses the two ideas, (1) of the divine free will and self-determination, and (2) of God's absolute self-consistency and unchangeableness (Mal. iii. 6), remaining and revealing himself throughout all eternity as one and the same. But the name (Exod. xxxiii. 19; 2 Kings viii. 1; Ezek. xii. 25) means more. It means the all-powerful one, who is determined by nothing else than his own will, and rules in history,—the Lord of the future, the God of the plan of salvation. (See Deut. xxxii. 39; Ps. cxxvii. 77 sqq.) Compared with Elohim and El, Jahre brings out the historical revelation of God, and his reign in his kingdom on the earth. Elohim refers to God's transcendency above the world, and his activity in its creation (Gen. i. 1). The difference is brought out in Ps. xix., where God is called El when his revelation in nature is referred to (1), but Jehovah when the reference is to his revelation in the Law (8 sqq.). Jehovah is the living God, who does all that he pleases (Ps. cvv. 3), —hears prayer, etc., in contrast with the gods of the heathen. For this reason there is no stronger oath than "Jehovah lives;" "Elohim lives" never being used. And, as it is Jehovah who reveals himself to men, anthropomorphisms (hands, eyes, mouth, etc.) are usually ascribed to Jehovah, and not to Elohim. Very striking is the juxtaposition in Gen. vii. 16.

III. Origin. — The origin of the name Jehovah, at least in the meaning above given, is to be looked for only in the Old Testament. Some have urged an Egyptian or Indian derivation; but these derivations have all been proved to be without foundation. (See especially Tholuck: Verm. Schriften.) But it is possible, as some proper names seem to indicate, that the word existed in another form, J-hu, amongst Semitic peoples, before it became current in Israel, although Baudissin says that this fact is due to the adoption of the God of the Hebrews as one of their gods by other peoples. The principal question is when the name was first revealed. Josephus explained Exod. vi. 3 ("by my name Jehovah was I not known to them") to mean that the patriarchs were not acquainted with it; but this view flatly contradicts Gen. iv. 26, xili. 8, and other passages. Another and the better explanation of the passage is, that the patriarchs did not fully understand its import (comp. Exod. xxxiii. 19, xxxiv. 6). The name is, then, to be regarded as having been known before the time of Moses, as is also plain from the fact that the name of Moses' mother [Jochebed, to Jehovah is the glory] contains it (Exod. vi. 20). See RELAND: Decas exercit. phil. de vera pronunt. nominis Jehovah, 1707; THOLUCK: Verm. Schriften, i. 377-405; [EWALD: D. Compos. d. Genesis, Braunschw., 1823; the excellent art. Jehovah, by W. ALDIS WRIGHT, in Smith's Bible Dictionary, and the Commentaries on Exod. iii. 14; also BAUDISSEN: Jahre et Moloch, Leipzig, 1871].

JEHUDAH (HA-LEVI) BEN SAMUEL, called by Arabic writers Abul Hassan, the greatest Jewish poet of the middle age, and father-in-law to the greatest Jewish grammarian of that age, Aben Ezra; b. in Castile, Spain; at his prime, 1140 A.D.; d. at Jerusalem about 1150; accord. to tradition, trampled to death by a Mohammedan horseman, because he lamented so loudly over the desolation
of the city. At once poet, philosopher, grammarian, scholar, he taught the faith of Judaism, to the wondering delight of his nation. To later ages he is known as the author of The Book of Consari, or, in full, The Book of Evidence and Argument in Apology for the Deputed Religion (i.e., Judaism), written in Arabic, first published in Hebrew translation at Fano, 1504, and at Venice, 1547; with an Introduction and Commentary by Muscato, Venice, 1594; with Latin translation by the younger Johannes Buxtorf. Basel, 1600; with a German translation by David Cassel, Leipzig, 1585. It is considered the ablest presentation of the superiority of Judaism to Heathenism,Mohammedanism, and Christianity. In it rabbinical learning and poetic beauty unite. See D. Kaufmann: Jehudah Halevi, Breslau, 1877, and art. Kohi in Herzog, ed. i., viii. 32-36.

JENKS, Benjamin, b. in Shropshire, 1646; d. at Harley, May 10, 1724; wrote a book which is still valued, Prayers and Offices of Devotion for Families, and for Particular Persons upon most Occasions, London, 1697; 27th edition by Rev. Charles Simeon, London, 1810, reprinted, 1866.

JENKS, William, D.D., LL.D., b. at Newton, Mass., Nov. 25, 1778; d. in Boston, Nov. 13, 1866. He was graduated from Harvard College 1797; entered the ministry; from 1815 to 1818 he was professor of English and Oriental literature in Bowdoin College, Me., when he resigned, went to Boston, and opened a private school. In that city he founded the first seamen's church, the parent of similar institutions in the country. From 1826 to 1845 he was pastor of a Congregational church in Green Street. During this period he compiled his Comprehensive Commentary on the Holy Bible, with Scott's References and Practical Observations, Matthew Henry's Commentary Condensed, Expository, Critical, and Philological Notes from Various Authors, Brattleborough, Vt., 1834, 5 vols., with supplementary vol.; now published in Philadelphia. It has been very extensively sold, and even adapted to the views of Baptists, by Rev. J. A. Warne.

JENKY, William, nonconformist divine and scholar; b. at Sudbury, Suffolk, Eng., 1612; d. in Newgate Prison, whither he had been sent for holding a conventicle, Jan. 18, 1655. He was educated at Cambridge, and possessed great ability. He is remembered for his excellent Exposition of the Epistle of Jude, London, 1652-54, 2 vols. 4to; reprinted by Rev. James Sherman, with memoir, London, 1839, and, in connection with Daille on Philippine and Colossians, Edinburgh, 1865.

JENNINGS, David, a dissenting minister; b. at Kibworth, Leicestershire, 1691; d. in London, Sept. 16, 1762, where he had been pastor for forty-four years. He is remembered for his Jewish Antiquities; or a Course of Lectures on the First Three Books of Godwin's Moses and Aaron, to which is annexed a Dissertation on the Hebrew Language, London, 1766, 2 vols.; 10th ed., 1839.

JEPHTHAH, a judge and towering tragic hero of Israel, the illegitimate son of a man of Gilead. His history is told in Judg. xi., xii. He was driven out of his father's house by the legitimate children, and went to the land of Tob, in Eastern Hauran, where he gathered about him a band of men. When the Ammonites invaded Israel, the chiefs of Gilead had recourse to Jephthah, who, complying with their appeal, undertook the office in the fear of God. He was not merely a fierce warrior, for he sent a delegation to the Ammonites in the interest of peace; but when they demanded a large tract of territory bounded by the Arnon, Jabbok, and Jordan, on the ground of possession prior to the Israelitish conquest, Jephthah sent back a gallant reply, to the effect that the territory was God's gift, and had been the lawful possession of Israel for three hundred years. The war broke out; but the Gileadite leader made a vow to dedicate to God, in case of victory, whatever he met, on his return, first coming towards him from his house. Jephthah, in his vow, did not think of his daughter, for daughters remained in the inner part of the houses, but of the triumphal procession that would be prepared for him on his return, with its presents to the victor, and the spoils of gold, weapons, etc., of the war.

As he returned from his triumph, the first to meet him was his own and only daughter with timbrel. His heart was broken; but his vow being publicly made will cost a pang to give up that which is dearest to him. And he does not hesitate, or seek for excuses in the letter of his vow; for a person was not included in the "whatsoever cometh forth" (Judg. xi. 31). It is a tragedy solitary in its pathos and contrasts. All is jubilation; only the author of it is not jubilant! The trumpets ring with the joyous strains of victory; and only the victor, crowned with glory, has a broken heart! He came to place the crown of the first citizen on his daughter's head, and he must offer her up! But how great a faith does not his words presuppose (Judg. xi. 35), and how grand does he not appear beside that Roman who offers up his son, only out of respect for military discipline! He was not right in thinking that God would be well pleased with such an offering; but he did not want to appear before the people as only willing to keep his vow when it demanded anything else but his child.

The spirit of the daughter is not beneath that of her father, and she is ready to be the sacrifice. This sacrifice did not consist, as some have urged, in the death of her daughter. The Jewish commentators have done well in insisting upon the meaning of or for ("and ") in the words of the vow, running, "shall surely be the Lord's, or (and) I will offer it up for a burnt offering." (Judg. xi. 31). If Jephthah had thought only of the burnt offering, the first clause would have been superfluous. Again: Jephthah knew the history of Israel too well (xi. 15-26, etc.) to have forgotten God's refusal to permit the sacrifice of Isaac. Further: such expressions as "she knew no man," and "let me bewail my virginity" (xi. 39) indicate the very nature of the sacrifice; and the daughters of Israel in after-years did not lament her death, but her virginity. It is in this sense the offering consisted, and the virginity only has a meaning on the supposition that she continued to live. It is interesting to remember that the maidens of the virgin Greek goddess Artemis celebrated a festival like that which the maidens of Israel celebrated over Jephthah's daughter.

Jephthah's last soldierly deed was the defeat
of the Ephraimites (Judg. xii.),— a tribe which
on several occasions raises claims after the danger
was over. He judged Israel six years. His name,
only means of escaping total destruction would
which does not occur in connection with any other
person, may be connected with ἰον ("mighty),
or with ἱφος, ("beautiful"), with which word many
Greek female names—Iphigenia, Iphigene, etc.
— seem to have a connection. The older exposition
resided at Anathoth (1 Kings ii. 26; 1 Chron.
xiv. 3). He was called at an early age to the
priest of Anathoth of the tribe of Benjamin
(i. 1, etc.), who, however, is not to be identified
with the high priest (2 Kings xxii. 4) of that
name (Clem. Alex., Jerome, Eichhorn, Umbreit),
as the high priest belonged to the house of Elea-
zah (Gen. iv. 26). Jeremiah was of a nature
resided at Anathoth (1 Kings ii. 26; 1 Chron.
xiv. 3). He was called at an early age to the
prophetic office (i. 6), and in the thirteenth year
of Josiah's reign (i. 2, xxv. 3)—629 or 627.
Josiah had already begun his reformatory activity
(2 Chron. xxxiv. 3); but the prophet was not
decided by the auspicious outlook. It is prob-
able that he prophesied for a time at Anathoth
(xi. 21), but then in Jerusalem. The first twenty-
two years of his prophetic career seem to have
passed without any notable personal incident,
and probably only the quintessence of his prophe-
cies during this period are preserved (iii.—x.).
The year 605 B.C., in which the battle of Car-
chemish was fought, marks a turning-point in his
life. Before this event, he had prophesied the
downfall of the theocracy; but now for the first
time (in chap. xxv.) he announces the name of
the people (the Jews) by whom it was to be
effectuated. Four years after Carchemish, Nebu-
chadnezzar made Judaea tributary to his kingdom
(2 Kings xxiv. 1). Jeremiah laid out a definite
sketch of the immediate future (seventy years),
not only of the theocracy, but also of the Chal-
dean monarchy, and the nations to be conquered
by it—Egypt, Uz, Edom, etc. (xxv. 19-20). All
resistance would be in vain (xxvii. 8), and the
only means of escaping total destruction would
be voluntary submission (xxvii. 11). At the end
of seventy years the land was to be delivered.
Immediately after the victory of Carchemish, he
regards Nebuchadnezzar's supremacy over Judaea
and the nations mentioned in xxv. 11 sqq. as not
only assured, but a matter of divine right. This
period of seventy years begins with 605 B.C., and
continues with 536 B.C., — the last year of the exile.
Another fact marking the progress of Jeremiah
after the turning-point just mentioned is, that,
in obedience to a divine command, he commenced
his prophecies to writing in the fourth year of
Jehoiakim's reign (xxvii. 1). What we read in
the twenty-fifth chapter and the chapters belonging
with it is the kernel and heart of the prophecy.
Jehoiakim, after being subject to Nebuchadne-
zzar, sought refuge in Egypt. He died at this date
(2 Kings xxiv. 1-6), and succeeded by his son
Jehoiachin, who reigned only three months (Jer.
l. 31-34). Then Nebuchadnezzar deported a
large portion of the people. Zedekiah followed
Jehoiachin (xxxvi. 1), but the Prophet, as an
obstinate one in consequence of the callousness of the people and stolid indifference
of its leaders (xxi.—xxv.). The king broke his oath promising fealty to Nebuchadnezzar,
in the expectation of aid from Egypt. The Chal-
deans besieged Jerusalem; but their expedition
against the Egyptians excited hopes which Jer-
emiah showed to be fallacious (xxvii. 6-11).
From this time dates the period of the proph-
et's severe afflictions. He was thrown into prison
(xxvii. 11-16). The king had recourse to him
for counsel; but the prophet, persisting in prophes-
ying the downfall of the city, was cast into a
"dungeon where there was no water, but mire"
(xxviii. 6), from which he was only rescued by
the intercession of a royal eunuch (xxxviii. 1-13).
This was the culmination of his sufferings; but
it is noticeable, that, just at this time of personal
suffering, the prophet utters his most glowing
prophecies as that of the Lord our Righteousness
( xxxviii. 16). In the eleventh year of Zedekiah's
reign, Jerusalem was taken. The prophet was
released, and betook himself to Mizpeh, the resi-
dence of Gedaliah, the Chaldean governor (xi.
1-6). The latter was soon afterwards murdered,
and Jeremiah was forced by the people to accom-
pany them to Egypt, although he had advised
against the expedition, as displeasing to God
(xii. 17-xliii.). At Tahpanhes, where the Jews
camped, he again lifted up his prophetic voice
against Egypt (xliv., lxxiv.); and this is the last
we hear of him in the Bible. Jerome (Adv. Jo-
s., ii. 37). Tertullian, and others relate that he
was stoned to death in Egypt. His grave is shown
at Cairo. The estimation in which Jeremiah was
held by his people after his death was as great as
his persecution had been severe during his life-
time. His prophecies were diligently studied by
the Jews in exile (Dan. ix. 2; 2 Chron. xxxvi.
21; Ez. i. 1). He was turned into an ideal hero
(2 Macc. ii. 1, xv. 14, etc.), and he gradually
came to be regarded as the prophet (6 προφητής)
who should re-appear again (Deut. xviii. 15); and
in the New Testament there are references to this
expectation (Matt. xvi. 14; John i. 34).
II. Character and Style.—Jeremiah had the most
painful and difficult task of any of the prophets.
By nature timid and sensitive, resembling John
the Evangelist, rather than John the Baptist,
temperament, he was, nevertheless, called upon to
carry on a life-and-death struggle with powerful
and embittered enemies. And not only had he
to utter warning words against his own nation,
but also against other nations. He was in con-
stant danger of his life (xi. 21, xx. 10 sqq., etc.).
Like a second Job, he cursed the day of his birth
(xx. 14), and longed to be free of his office (xx.
6). The recollection, however, of his official re-
sponsibilities was "in his heart as a burning fire,
shut up in his bones." Every one was against
him. He stood alone, at least in the period of
the greatest national misery. Ezekiel and Daniel
lived with him after the great catastrophe; but
they lived in exile. Jeremiah, therefore, in the
period of Israel's deepest humiliation, stood alone,
as a rock in the sea, resisting, by the help of God, the assaults of hostile forces,
represents in his own personal life and attitude the servant of God; at the highest stage of his development in the history of the Old Testament. He was a type, not of John the Baptist, as Hengstenberg holds, but of Christ himself. The first destruction of Jerusalem corresponds to the second; and, as Jeremiah was the prophet of the former, so Christ was the prophet of the latter (Matt. xxiii. 29—32; Luke xiii. 34, etc.). And, as the former was despised and persecuted for telling unwelcome tidings, so was Christ; and in his crucifixion the people filled up the measure of their fathers' hatred (Matt. xxvi. 32), which culminated upon Jeremiah. If Jeremiah be the author of Ps. cxlii. (a view I would unconditionally adopt, but for the heading), then the comparison becomes even more striking.
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ambassador, and brought with him letters of recommendation to the patriarch from Jacob Andreas, chancellor of the university of Tübingen, and Martin Crusius, the celebrated Hellenist and historian. The letters were well received; and the Tübingen professors, at that moment the chief representatives of Lutheranism, were not slow to avail themselves of the proffered opportunity of establishing an intercommunication between the Greek Church and the Reformation. They sent a second letter, dated Sept. 15, 1574, and accompanied with a Greek translation of the Confessio Augustana, and a third letter, dated March 20, 1576, and accompanied with a Greek translation of two sermons by Andreas. The patriarch's answer, dated May 15, 1576, consists of an elaborate treatise, in which he goes through the whole confession, part by part. Now and then he praises, as, for instance, the articles on the church, the ecclesiastical office, the marriage of priests, etc.; but generally he censures, especially the introduction of Púloque in the creed, the depreciation of good works, etc. The treatise, however, induced the Tübingen theologians to give a systematical representation of the principles on which their confession rested; and a new letter was sent, dated June 18, 1577, and written by Lucas Osiander and Crusius. But it took two years before the patriarch's answer arrived (May, 1579), and it read more like a rebuke than an answer. Nevertheless, Andreas, Schnepf, Bidembach, and Heerbrand determined to try once more, and sent, in the spring, 1580, a defence to Constantinople; but the patriarch's answer of June 6, 1581, was curt and final. In 1582 the Roman canon, Stanislaus Socolovius, published a report of these negotiations, and a Latin translation of the respective documents, under the title, Censura orientalis ecclesiae, etc.; but, as the purpose of that undertaking was simply to hurt the Protestant cause, the Tübingen theologians gave themselves a report with the documents, Latin and Greek, Acte scripta theologorum Wirtembergensium et Patriarchae Constantinopolitani D. Hieronimi, etc., 1584. G.88.

Jericho, the City of, stood in the valley of the Jordan, five miles west of the river, and six or seven miles north of the Dead Sea. Between the craggy and barren mountains of Judah on the one side, and the lofty but equally barren mountains of Moab on the other side, the valley of the Jordan is sunk about nine hundred feet below the level of the Mediterranean, the climate thereby becoming completely tropical. Scorched by the heat, the plain stretches along, yellow and desolate, until about Jericho, where a number of springs, among which is the Fountain of Elisha (2 Kings ii. 19—22), form small streams, and at once, as if by magic, transform the desert into a luxuriant garden. Even in the times of Joshua, Jericho was spoken of as “the city of the palm-trees” (Deut. xxxiv. 3; Judg. ii. 16; 2 Chron. xxxviii. 15). The wheat ripened there several weeks earlier than in other places of the country (Lev. xxiii. 10). Flax and hemp were cultivated there (Josh. ii. 6), and the place was celebrated for its roses (Eccles. xxiv. 14), its sycomores (Luke xix. 4), its balsam, grapes, etc. When the Israelites engaged at Bethel, a nameless prophet from Judah engaged at Bethel, a nameless prophet from Judah, or er-Riba. The creation, however, of the Crusaders, did not prosper. At present the palms have disappeared; the roses, the balsam, have gone; and of the splendid old city nothing is left but a heap of ruins. The site is now inhabited by a degraded race, scattered about in some miserable huts. For pertinent literature, see PALESTINE. FR. W. SCHULTZ.

Jeroboam (whose people is many), the name of two kings of Israel. I. (1 Kings xi. 26—38, xii. 1—xiv. 20; cf. 2 Chr. x.—xiii.) The son of Nebat, an Ephrainite, raised by Solomon, on account of his superior capacity, to be superintendent of the levies furnished by the house of Joseph. Some time after this the prophet Ahijah met him in a field near Jerusalem, and, tearing his mantle into twelve pieces, gave him ten, to indicate that the kingdom was to be dismembered, and he was to rule ten tribes. Perhaps Solomon heard of this prophecy; but at all events Jeroboam thought it prudent to flee to Egypt, where he remained until Solomon's death. On his return he headed the disaffected ten tribes in their revolt, and was chosen their king. (See REHOBOAM.) In order to strengthen his hold, he revived the ancient calf-worship at Bethel and Dan, the southern and northern limits of his territory respectively, and with his sons officiated at the altars. While thus engaged at Bethel, a nameless prophet from Judah predicted in his presence the birth of King Josiah, who should destroy that altar, and sacrifice its priests upon it. Jeroboam stretched forth his hand to order the prophet's arrest, when he found it so stiff he could not move it; meanwhile the altar was miraculously rent, in confirmation of the prophet's authority, and he had to implore the prophet's prayer for his restoration. The king, however, persisted in his calf-worship; and since the Levites had refused to obey him, and gone to Judah, he made a new priesthood, irrespective of tribal ancestry. He reigned for twenty-seven years, and waged unremitting warfare with Judah.

II. (2 Kings xiv. 23—29.) The son of Joash, and great-grandson of Jehu; was king of Israel for forty-one years, and enjoyed a reign of extraordinary splendor and success. He recovered the full extent of the northern kingdom, having reduced all the revolted countries on the east of the Jordan. Yet Hosea and Amos (ii. 6—16, v. 7—8) show plainly that during his long reign vice was rampant. Jerome (Hieronymus) Sophronius

Joshua, and allotted to Benjamin (Josh. xviii. 21). In the Old Testament it is mentioned sixty-three times, and in the New Testament, seven, — the meeting with Zacchens (Luke xix. 1—9), the healing of the blind men (Matt. xx. 24—34; Mark x. 46—52; Luke xviii. 35—43). When the Romans conquered the country, they built an excellent road from Jericho to Jerusalem. Anthony presented the balsam-gardens to Cleopatra, who sold them to Herod. He fortified the city, adorned it with a palace and a circus, and chose it for his winter residence. Destroyed by Titus, it was restored by Justinian, who built a church and a hospice there. Again destroyed by the Arabs, it was once more restored by the Crusaders, though not exactly on the same site. New Jericho occupied the same place as the present village of Riba, or er-Riba. The creation, however, of the Crusaders, did not prosper. At present the palm-trees have disappeared; the roses, the balsam, have gone; and of the splendid old city nothing is left but a heap of ruins. The site is now inhabited by a degraded race, scattered about in some miserable huts. For pertinent literature, see PALESTINE. FR. W. SCHULTZ.
EUSEBIUS, the most erudite and scholarly among the Fathers of the Latin Church; b., as we gather from his letters, at Stridon, on the border-line separating Dalmatia and Pannonia, between 340 and 342; d. at Bethlehem, Sept. 30, 420. After studying with his father Eusebius, a Christian, he went to Rome, where he was introduced into Greek philosophy and Roman literature. Christian Rome also exerted an influence on his mind; and he speaks, in the Introduction to his Commentary on Ezekiel, of the feelings of reverence with which he had visited the catacombs.

He was baptized by Bishop Liberius in 360. In a journey to Gaul (about 372) he made the acquaintance of Rufinus, subsequently his rival and opponent. About the same time he started on a tour to the East, and tarried till 374 in Antioch. A dream changed the tenor of his literary life. Christ appeared to him with the words, "Jerome, thou art not a Christian, but a Ciceronian." This led Jerome to give himself almost exclusively to ecclesiastical studies. His works, however, abound in references to the classics.

A fever which attacked him at Antioch gave to his mind a powerful impulse to asceticism, and he retired to the wastes of Chalcis, south-east of Antioch. His constitution, however, could not bear the severe habits of abstinence and penance; so that he returned to Antioch, where he was ordained presbyter in 379, against his will. He went to Constantinople to sit at the feet of Gregory Nazianzen, and from there back to Rome (382). The Roman bishop, Damasus, respected his scholarship, and secured his assistance in ecclesiastical writings (in chartis eccles. adiuvare); which has led some writers to the opinion that he occupied the post of papal secretary or librarian. A company of Christian women gathered around him to listen to his expositions of Scripture, and to be influenced towards a conventual life. With two of their number, Paula and her daughter Eustochium, he went on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land in 385. On his way he stopped in Egypt, where he heard the blind Idymus interpreting Hosea.

A fever which attacked him at Antioch gave to his mind a powerful impulse to asceticism, and he retired to the wastes of Chalcis, south-east of Antioch. His constitution, however, could not bear the severe habits of abstinence and penance; so that he returned to Antioch, where he was ordained presbyter in 379, against his will. He went to Constantinople to sit at the feet of Gregory Nazianzen, and from there back to Rome (382). The Roman bishop, Damasus, respected his scholarship, and secured his assistance in ecclesiastical writings (in chartis eccles. adiuvare); which has led some writers to the opinion that he occupied the post of papal secretary or librarian. A company of Christian women gathered around him to listen to his expositions of Scripture, and to be influenced towards a conventual life. With two of their number, Paula and her daughter Eustochium, he went on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land in 385. On his way he stopped in Egypt, where he heard the blind Idymus interpreting Hosea.

In the Holy Land he retired to a cell in the vicinity of Bethlehernear which Paula presided, was soon erected, and an inn for pilgrims. Here Jerome remained till his death, engaged in devotions and literary labors, but finding, also, time to participate in the ecclesiastical disputes of the day.

The scholarly and literary activity of Jerome was far more prominent than the theological; but he was intensely solicitous to be known as orthodox; as, for example, when he submitted himself blindly to the bishop of Rome in the Mileian dispute. Once an enthusiastic follower of Origen, whose writings he had translated, he renounced his veneration for them. He knew himself blindly to the liishop of Rome in the

Jerome's Letters are also very important: they answer questions of conscience, commend monastic life, comfort the sorrowing, flatter friends, condemn the vices and follies of the day, etc. They were extravagantly admired in the ancient church; but Luther, with characteristic penetration, in his Table-Talk said in regard to them, "I know no teacher to whom I am so hostile as Hieronymus; for he writes only of fasting, meats, virginity, etc. If he only had insisted upon the works of faith, and performed them! But he teaches nothing either about faith, or love, or hope, or the works of faith."


JEROME OF PRAGUE, Bohemian reformer and martyr; of a noble family of Prague; b. about 1305; d. at the stake, in Constance, May 30, 1415. He studied at Oxford, and returned to Prague with Wichl's theological writings. In 1398 he took the degree of bachelor of arts at Prague, and subsequently that of master in Paris. He did not return to Prague till 1407, when he entered into hearty sympathy with the plans of Hus. In 1410 he went, on the invitation of the king of Poland, to assist in putting the university of Cracow on a secure basis, and from there to Orefen to preach before Sigismund, king of Hungary. He was suspected of heretical doctrines, however, and fled to Vienna, but was put in prison, from which he was released on the requisition of the university of Prague.

When, in October, 1414, Hus was about to leave for Constance, Jerome encouraged him to fortitude, and promised to go to his assistance if necessary. On April 4, 1415, he fulfilled his promise, but, on the advice of the Bohemian nobles, fled.
from Constance the day after his arrival. He was recognized at Hirschau by his denunciations of the council, taken prisoner, and sent back in chains. When Constantine’s death, the council attempted to induce Jerome to retract, and succeeded Sept. 10; but the day following he withdrew his retraction. The council instituted a second trial, but not until the following May (1416) was he granted a public hearing. All attempts to move him again were unavailing. On May 30 he was condemned by the council as a heretic. As the flames crept about him, he sang the Easter hymn, *Salve festa dies*, etc. (“Hail, festal day”), and repeated the three articles of the Apostolic Creed concerning God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Compared with Hus, Jerome was, perhaps, his superior in intellectual endowments and learning, but his inferior in nobility of soul, and strength of will. The unalloyed joyfulness and heroism with which he died attested for the weakness he had before shown in retracting.


**JERUSALEM (abode of peace).** I. **Situation and Present Condition.** — The city is built upon high ground in the midst of a semi-desert. It is thirty-two miles east of the Mediterranean Sea, and eighteen miles north of the Dead Sea. Above it tower the surrounding hills, and around it lies the dry, rough country. The atmosphere is wonderfully clear. The temperature in summer is sometimes as high as 102° Fahr., and in winter as low as 28°; but on the average the highest mean temperature, according to observations extending over five years, is 77° in July, and the lowest 42°.8 in January. Snow often falls in January and February, even to the depth of a foot; but the ground never freezes. On the east stretches the monotonous range which constitutes the watershed between the Mediterranean and the Dead Sea. The middle one is the Mount of Ascension, 2,840 feet; the northern is the Mount of Offence, so called from its having been the seat of Solomon’s idol-worship (1 Kings xi. 7, 8). South of the city is the Hill of Evil Counsel, separated from the Mount of Offence by the Kidron Valley (which see), and so called from the monastic tradition, that upon it Caiphas had his house, and held the deliberations spoken of in Matt. xxi. 3, 4, John xi. 47-53. Between it and the city is the Valley of Hinnom. On the west stretches the monotonous range which constitutes the watershed between the Mediterranean and the Dead Sea. Nearer the city is the Valley of Gihon. On the north is Mount Scopus.

The ground of the city rises from east to west: so, as Josephus has already remarked, the city lies in the manner of a theatre (*Antiq.*, XV. 11, 5); but it is much evener than it was, for in the course of centuries many of the inequalities have been levelled up, and among them the Tyropoeon Valley, or Valley of the Cheese-sellers. The excavations carried on by the British Ordnance Survey have revealed the enormous substructure built by Solomon to support the broad levels of his temple and its courts. In the eastern wall of the present Haram enclosure is the Golden Gate, covered in 1820, and raised up externally; 26 feet above the ground. The Haram wall was in one place originally a hundred and twenty feet above the ground. Here, doubtless, issued a south-easterly valley, of which at present there are no traces. Between the east and west parts of the city there runs a depression, which in places is filled by débris to the depth of a hundred feet. Between the southern and northern parts of the western half of the city there is a cut from west to east. In consequence of this cut, the city is divided into three parts: — the holy part, which included the temple, on the east; on the south-west, Zion; and on the north-west the business part, in which is the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. As a fourth part may be reckoned the hill Bezetha.

The view of Jerusalem from Olivet or Scopus is imposing. Around the present city is a wall, thirty-eight feet and a half high, having thirty-four towers and seven gates, and with a total circumference of two miles and a fifth. Within it one sees the innumerable domes upon, the balustrades around, the flat roofs of the houses; the minarets, like tapers against the clear sky, the mosques and the churches, of which the chief are the Mosque of Omar and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre respectively; the cloisters and the public buildings; and, highest of all, that reminder of the Turkish rule, the Citadel. Nor does entrance entirely dispel the pleasing impression. The streets are, it is true, narrow; but they are cleaner, and the houses are better built, than those of Smyrna or Constantinople. Damascus Street divides the Christian or Greek quarter (the north-west part) from the Moelem quarter; and Bazaar Street, running at right angles, divides the Armenian quarter from the Greek.

II. **The Origin of the Different Parts of the City.** — *Jebus* (see art.), Jerusalem, *Zela* Capitolina, El-Kuds (“the sanctuary”), by these names successively has the city been known. When David took Jebus, giving rise to the term “city of David,” the city was on Mount Zion, which was neither the north, nor the south-east, nor the southern part of the temple hill, but the south-west part of the city, extending to the Jaffa Gate. Reasons for this view are: (a) Neither in the north-west nor in the south-east has there ever later been a citadel; (b) Micah (iii. 12) very clearly distinguishes Zion from the temple hill; (c) Too much building is spoken of in Neh. iii. for Zion to be part of the temple hill; (d) Although Zion and the temple hill are identical in the mouths of psalmists and prophets, uniform tradition identifies the city of David with the hill in the south-west part of the city; cf. 1 Macc. i. 33, Josephus (*War*, V. 4, 1; *Antiq.*, VII. 3, 2), Eusebius, and Jerome.

David materially enlarged Jebus, and made it the political and religious capital of the nation; but to Solomon it owed most. Besides the temple upon Mount Moriah, he built his great palace upon Ophel, as is proven by (a) the circumstance that the daughter of Pharaoh was brought up in the house of the city of David (1 Kings iii. 1) unto her house which Solomon had built for her” (ix. 24); (b) the “ascent by which he went up unto the house of the Lord” (x. 5); (c) Micah (iv. 8), who brings the “tower of the flock,” in connection with Ophel, and Janiah (1 Kings i. 14) which in the same connection the “watch-tower,” by
which he probably means the same tower of the palace; (d) the entire narrative in Neh. iii.; and (e) especially the mention of the Horse Gate in verse 28, which shows it, the king’s palace and its tower were south of the temple. The temple, with its courts, did not nearly cover the present Haram enclosure; and there were about it many private houses. A third important building of Solomon was Millo (1 Kings ix. 15, 24), not to be confounded with the Millo mentioned in 2 Sam. v. 9, which had probably fallen down, but a new fortress on the north-west corner of Zion.

In the post-Solomonic time the city grew in the neighborhood of the temple, as was quite natural, inasmuch as it was the centre of so much life. Isaiah (vii. 3) speaks of Fuller’s-field Street, running north from Zion, and Jeremiah (xxxvii. 21), of Bakers’ Street, in the same locality, where were also, in after-time, the quarters of the smiths and the cheesemakers, the fish and the sheep markets. The lower city was in the same direction, and particularly inhabited by merchants and capitalists (Zeph. i. 10). “The city of David” extended, probably, as far as Siloah; and upon Ophel also there were many houses. After the exile Jerusalem took a long time to recuperate. In Nebuchadnezzar’s time the old walls were far removed from the dwellings (Neh. vii. 4). Eventually, however, it even overran its ancient limits; so that a new suburb, Bezetha, was built up (Josephus: War, V. 4, 2). The number of inhabitants of Jerusalem is not easily calculated: twenty thousand is probably too low an estimate for the pre-exilic time. Josephus says that at the passover there were two million seven hundred thousand in the city (War, VI. 9, 3).

III. THE WALLS, GATES, AND TOWERS.

The Walls. — There were three walls on the north of the city, while on the other sides there was only one. The course of the northern walls is disputed, and hence individual opinion alone can be stated. When it is said that Solomon built the wall of Jerusalem from Zion to the sea, it is meant that he built higher and stronger, and provided with towers, walls already existing. Who built the wall about the second city is unknown; but this was the wall of which four hundred cubits were broken down by Jehoash, king of Israel (2 Kings xiv. 13), and restored by Uzziah (Josephus: Antiq. IX. 10, 3). Wall-building is also attributed to Jotham (2 Chron. xxvii. 3), Hezekiah (xxxi. 5), and Manasseh (xxviii. 14). The First Wall, according to Josephus, ran from the Tower of Hippicus, on the north side of Zion, to the temple, on the west side to the Gate of the Essenes, on the south to the Fountain of Siloah, and thence, making a bend, around to the east side of the temple. The Second Wall began, says the same authority, at the Gennath, or Garden Gate, which belonged to the first wall, and, compassing the northern quarter, reached as far as the Tower Antonia. The interpretation is disputed. Robinson puts the Garden Gate in the extreme north-west corner of Zion; so that, according to him, the second wall ran first north-west, and then north-east, somewhat in the course of the present walls, to the inside of the Damascus Gate, then down中山街, apparently to Antonia, or east to the Kedron. This puts the Church of the Holy Sepulchre entirely inside the walls, and destroys its claim to be the true site. But against this view may be urged, (a) When Cestius, in the year 66, had broken through the third wall, he burnt Bezetha and the wood-market without being hindered by the second wall, pressed upon the upper city,—i.e., to the north-west,—and opposite to it pitched his tent (Josephus: War, II. 19, 4). (b) In explanation of the determination of Titus to open his attack at the monument of John the high priest, which stood in the north-western New City; Josephus expressly states, that there “the first fortification was lower, and the second not joined to it[i.e., to the outermost wall, so that a part of the New City was enclosed by it]; the builders neglecting to build the wall strong when the New City was not much inhabited. Here, also, was an easy passage to the third wall, through which he (Titus) thought to take the upper city, and, through the tower of Antonia, the temple itself” (War, V. 6, 2). (c) When Titus had carried the second wall, and torn down its northern part, he erected two banks for the capture of the upper city, and two for that of Antonia. The first two were outside of the second wall, by John’s monument; the second two, by the Pool Amygdalon, which was also outside the second wall. The second wall may be considered to have started at the present bazaar, and run, first northwards, then eastwards, from the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, gradually bending towards the east, and then somewhere upon the ridge, which is visible to the east from the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, extending to the Antonia Tower. The Third Wall (Josephus: War, V. 4, 2), which took in the New City in the north-west and north, was begun by Herod Agrippa I. about A.D. 42; but, out of fear of Claudius Caesar, he stopped with the foundations, and it was finished after a lighter pattern by later Jews. Its entire height was twenty-five cubits, with battlements of two cubits, and turrets of three cubits. It was defended by ninety towers, of which the strongest was Psephismon, at the east angle, west from the Latin convent, upwards of a hundred feet high, and upon the highest ground of the city (twenty-five hundred and ninety feet above the sea). The course of this third wall was probably, in general, that of the present walls.

The Gates. — There were four gates to the temple enclosure. On the north, the Upper Gate of the House of Jehovah, also called the Upper Gate of Benjamin (Jer. xxxviii. 7), or the New Gate (xxxvi. 10); on the east, the King’s Gate (1 Chron. ix. 18), called the Gate of the Inner Court (Ezek. xiv. 1), and the East Gate (Neh. iii. 29); on the west, the Gate Shallecheth (1 Chron. xxvi. 10); on the south, the Gate Miphkad (Neh. iii. 31); and, besides these, the Gate Sur (2 Kings xi. 8), or Gate of Foundation (2 Chron. xxiii. 5), and the Gate behind the Guard (2 Kings xi. 6). City gates mentioned are the Corner Gate (2 Chron. xxvi. 9), probably the north-west of the second city; the Valley Gate (ibid.), on the north-west corner of Zion, the site of the present Jaffa Gate. The following gates are not spoken of after the pre-exilic period: (1) The Gate of Joshua, the governor of the city (2 Kings xxiii. 9); (2) the Pottery Gate (A. V., the East Gate, Jer. xix. 2), in the south wall of Zion, leading to
the Valley of Hinuom; (3) the Middle Gate (Jer. xxxix. 3), in the royal palace, leading to the middle city; (4) the gate between the two walls (2 Kings xxv. 4; Jer. xxxix. 4), in the south end of Ophel, where the west and east walls of these hills meet. For learning the gates of the post-exilian period, Nehemiah (particularly chap. iii.) is the best guide. Beginning with the Sheep Gate in the east, north from the then temple area, and south of the present St. Stephen's Gate, and going west, there came in order the Fish Gate, where the Tyrian fish-market was held; the Old Gate; the Gate of Ephraim or of Benjamin; the Valley Gate, on the north-west corner of Zion; southward, the Dung Gate, near the present Birket el Sultan; the Fountain Gate, close to the Pool of Siloam; then came the Stairs that go down from the city of David. The next gate mentioned is the Water Gate, on the south end of Ophel, through which the water used for libations in the feast of tabernacles was drawn. Next and last came the Horse Gate, through which the king's horses were taken to their stalls in the substruction of the temple area.

Four gates are spoken of: (1) the Tower of Meah, (2) the Tower of Hananeel,—both near together, between the Sheep Gate and the Fish Gate, (3) the Tower of the Furnaces, between the Gate of Ephraim and the Valley Gate.

The walls were almost entirely destroyed, along with the city, by Titus, A.D. 70, but rebuilt by Hadrian, A.D. 113-136, who probably restored the old citadel built by Herod; for in 1099 the crusaders found at the spot a fortress which long resisted their attacks. They called it the Tower of David, and this name it has retained until the present day. It is now the most prominent object as one enters the Jaffa Gate, and consists of five square towers originally surrounded by a ditch. The foundations of the towers are manifestly ancient. It is probably the Tower of Phasaelus. The present walls are of Arabic construction, and date from Sultan Suleyman! (1536-39). Both those and those of Hadrian, in unintentional but apparent literal fulfilment of Mic. iii. 12 ("therefore shall Zion for your sake be ploughed as a field"), do not circumvent the southern part of Zion, thus shutting it off from the city. But in general the new walls rest upon the old foundations.

IV. THE MOST IMPORTANT BUILDINGS AND SITES.—Akra was situated near the temple. It is called by Josephus, our only informer, "the Lower City," and corresponds to the present Christian quarter upon the rocky ridge between the Tyropoeon and the "broad" valley. It took its name from the fortress Akra, built by Antiochus. (See Joseph.: Antiq., XII. 5, 4.)

Baris, or Antonia as Herod called it, was a citadel belonging to the temple, and on its north-west corner, mentioned by Nehemiah (ii. 8, cf. vii. 2 [A. V. "palace" = fortress, in Hebrew Birah, which corresponds to the Greek Bras]), called by Joseph the Antonia, called by Philip, Zacharias, and Hadrian, the Antonia, fortified by Simon (1 Macc. xiii. 52), but especially by Herod (War. I. 8, 3). It commanded the temple, and interiorly was fitted up like a palace.

The Palace of the Ammonians was on the north-east side of Zion, opposite the south-west corner of the temple (Antiq., XX. 8, 11).

The Palace of Herod was upon the site of the old tower of David (War. V. 4, 4). The Palace of the High Priest, built by Herod, was in the Upper City.

The Theatre was also built by Herod (Antiq., XV. 8, 1); perhaps it was identical with the Hippodrome on the southerly part of the Upper City. His Amphitheatre was north of the city (Antiq., XV. 8, 1). The Xystus, for gymnastic exercises, and a place for popular assemblages, was on the extreme north-east corner of Zion (War. V. 4, 2; VI. 8, 2; 6, 2; 8, 1). The Town-hall was between the Xystus and the temple, probably by the side of the western hall of the temple.

The Connection between the City and the Temple. —According to Antiq. XV. 11, 5, there were in the west side of the temple enclosure four gates, of which one led to the king's palace, and went to a passage over the intermediate valley; two led to the suburbs of the city; and the fourth led to the Lower City, where the road descended into the valley by a great number of steps. The first evidently led to the bridge between the temple and Xystus (War. II. 16, 3). The "suburbs" were called Akra. Many traces of old gates and bridges have been discovered on the west side of the Haram; but these can scarcely be identified with those mentioned by Josephus. For instance, the Bab es Silseleh, or Gate of the Chain, the principal entrance to the Haram on the west, stands upon an arch discovered by Capt. Wilson; but the road over this bridge apparently did not lead to the Upper City, but to the suburb lying immediately to the north. About midway between the Bab es Silseleh and the south-west corner of the Haram, somewhat south of the Jews' Wailing-Place, Barclay discovered the so-called "Gate of the Prophet." Robinson's Arch, so called because discovered by him, is thirty-nine feet north of the south-west end of the Haram. It consists of three courses of huge stones projecting from the wall, forming the segment of an arch, which extends fifty feet along the wall.

Places connected with the Passion and Ascension of our Lord.—The house in which the Last Supper was eaten, and, later, the miraculous tongues of fire of Pentecost were seen, is traditionally placed on the southern brow of Zion, not now within the walls. It is the Cenaculum of the present day, the "upper room" of the Evangelists, and was probably the Church of the Apostles spoken of by Cyril of Jerusalem in the fourth century. It is in the group of buildings over the pretended tomb of David, and is fifty feet long by thirty wide. The Palace of Caiaphas, between the Cenaculum and the Zion Gate, is an Armenian cloister. The Pretorium, or Judgment-hall of Pilate, was probably in Antonia. (See Garbatha.) The Via Dolorosa proper, along which Jesus is supposed to have been led, bearing his cross, runs from Antonia to the Church of the Sepulchre, passing the Ecce Homo Arch near the Church of the Flagellation. The name is, however, now given to the whole street of Olives running from St. Stephen's Gate to the street of the Gate of the Column, of which the traditional Via Dolorosa is part. At the foot of the Mount of Olives, opposite St. Stephen's Gate, was Gethsemane. The present site so called is a little garden, with eight olive-trees of great age, though scarcely as
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old as Christianity, in charge of Franciscan monks. It is probably rightly placed. About a hundred paces distant is the Grotto of the Agony (antrum agonie), a dark, irregular cave, hewn in the rock. The place of the ascension is fixed by Luke xxiv. 50. It led them out and, as they were going, they met Jesus (Bethany), between the Mount of Olives and the Hill of Offence, where the road winds towards Bethany. But tradition puts the spot on the top of Olivet, and there Helena built a church, now destroyed. A small chapel, under the charge of the Mohammedans, occupies the traditional spot: near it is the place where, according to monastic tradition, Jesus taught his disciples the Lord's Prayer, and the Apostles composed the Creed. Bethphage lay nearer to Jerusalem than Bethany (which see), and rather off the direct road. In the Talmud it is often mentioned as within the city limits. The name was probably given to several successive places, which would account for the conflicting traditions as to its site. Schick puts it between the Kidron and Bethany.

V. THE WATER-SUPPLY. — Since Jerusalem lies in a rocky limestone region, it is to be expected that it would be a centre of streams; but this natural lack was formerly supplied by an extensive system of aqueducts, pools, and cisterns; so that in no one of her numerous sieges do we read of any suffering for water on the part of the inhabitants, while the besiegers have often suffered severely. At the present day rain-water is exclusively used; and the better class of houses have three or four cisterns, from five to thirty feet long by the same in breadth, and ten to twenty feet deep, generally vaulted, with a small opening on top, surrounded by stone-work, and provided with bucket and wheel. But formerly there were aqueducts from north, west, and especially from the south. That from the north can be identified with the subterranean canal which has an opening under the Convent of the Sisters of Zion, and flows thence southwards to the west side of the Haram. That from the west can be traced from the Russian colony into the cit. (1) An aqueduct extended along the hillside, but so arranged that the bottom of each pool was higher than the top of the one below it, in order that as much water might be collected as possible. The water in them comes from "a subterranean fountain some distance up the valley to the north-west. The only visible mark is an opening like the mouth of a well, generally covered by a large stone. The water springs up at four places, from which little ducts carry it into a basin: it then flows through a subterranean passage to a place at the north-west corner of the upper pool. Here the stream is divided, a portion flowing into a vault twenty-four feet by five, and thence through a duct at the side into the upper pool. The remainder of the water is carried by an aqueduct along the hillside, but so arranged as to send a portion off into the second and third pools: it fills the lower end of the lower pool, and runs by Bethlehem in a winding course to Jerusalem." — J. L. Porter, in Murray's Handbook for Travellers in Syria and Palestine, 1875, p. 107].

There are two fountains, or by the temple: hence the allusions in Joel iii. 18, Zech. xlvii. 1-12, Zech. xiv. 8. The principal one is Siloam, mentioned in Neh. iii. 15, Isa. viii. 6, and John ix. 11, and called by Mohammed "a Fountain of Paradise." Its name, "Sent," indicated that its water was conveyed to some pool; and this pool, according to Neh. iii. 15 (cf. War, V. 4, 1, 2), was opposite the south-east end of Zion, in the lower part of the Tyropoeon Valley, on the west side of Ophel. All the conditions are met in the present Pool of Siloam, — a reservoir fifty-three feet long, eighteen wide, and nineteen deep, about two hundred and fifty-five feet from the end of the Tyropoeon,—but even better in the somewhat larger Birket el Hamra, farther down in the Kidron, now filled with earth. The present so-called "Pool of Siloam" then corresponds to the "pool that was made" (cf. Neh. iii. 16), but probably receives its water from the same spring as the real Pool of Siloam. The Fountain of the Virgin (Ain sitt Miriam) is on the west bank of the Kidron, three hundred yards south of the Haram, on the other side of Ophel from the Pool of Siloam: it is now called "Ain um ed Deraj" (the Fountain of the Mother of Stairs), because one must go down thirty steps to reach the water. The peculiarity of the fountain is the intermittent flow of the water. Often two or three times a day, except in summer, when this happens only two or three times a week, the water rises suddenly several feet during a quarter of an hour, and then flows out with a gurgling sound through a channel leading to the Pool of Siloam, until its ordinary level is reached. The connecting canal between the Fountain of the Virgin and the Pool of Siloam has been explored by Robinson (April, 1838), Tobler (March, 1840), and Warren; and the rise and fall of the water — vigorously
explained by the movement of a dragon, flowing when he awakes, and stopping while he sleeps—has been found to be due to the intermittent character of its source, as was noticed by Jerome in regard to the Pool of Siloam, but not now visible in it, owing to the slower and smaller flow of water. The water in the Fountain of the Virgin is now unpleasant to the taste. [In June, 1880, one of the pupils of Herr Schick, German archi-
tect long resident in Jerusalem, accidentally fell into the Pool of Siloam, and thus discovered some letters in the wall of the conduit from the Foun-
tain of the Virgin. By the united efforts of Herr Schick, Professor A. H. Sayce, Dr. Guthe, and others, the inscription has been almost entirely copied. It consists of six lines in a space twenty-eight inches long by eight inches in height. It is thus transcribed upon page 403 of The Presbyterian Review, April number, 1882: "The excavation. Now this is the story of the excavation. While . . . the pick, one toward the other. While three cubic . . . the voice of one called to the other that there was an overflow (?) in the rock, wall . . . The height of the rock over the head of the excava-
tors struck each to meet the other, pick over against pick, and the waters flowed from their outlet in the pool 1,200 cubic, and 100 cubic was the height of the rock over the head of the excava-
tors." Various dates have been assigned to the inscription, from Solomon to Hezekiah. Its archae-ological importance is slight. But its discovery will doubtless be found. Another aqueduct, two or more feet deep by three feet and a half wide, leading down the Kedron from the Old Pool, discovered in the spring of 1882. The channel is rock cut, and roofed over with slabs.

En Rogel is a well of living water below the city, in the Valley of Jehoshaphat, famous as the site of Adoniah's feast (1 Kings i. 9), now called by the Arabs Bir Eyub (the Well of Jacob), and by the Franks "the Well of Nehemiah," because Nehemiah there found the holy fire (2 Macc. i. 19, 22). It is a hundred and twenty-five feet deep, with fifty feet of sweet water.

Besides these fountains, there are several pools. The Lower Pool (Isa. xxii. 9) is identified with the Birket es Sultan (sc. Soleymen), in the Ghizon Valley, below the south-eastern angle of the city's wall. The Old Pool (Isa. xxii. 11; cf. 2 Chron. xxxiii. 30, "upper watercourse of Ghizon," and 2 Kings xviii. 17; Isa. vii. 3, "Upper Pool, in the highway of the Fuller's Field") is identified with the Birket el-Manila (so called from St. Manilla's Church), in the upper end of Ghizon. It is filled with rain-water in winter, but empty and dry in summer and autumn. The water of this pool is conducted into the Pool of Jeheshiah, or of the Patriarchs (Birket Hammam el-Batrak), inside the city, near the Jaffa Gate. For the Pool of Bethzatha, see BETHSA.
Constantine and his mother Helena they received substantial support. The former built the Church of the Holy Sepulchre; the latter, the Church of the Ascension, on the Mount of Olives. The patriarchate of Jerusalem (see art.) was erected in 451. Justinian built the Church of the Virgin, or Theotokos ("mother of God"), upon the south-western part of the temple area, and ten or eleven convents, besides a hospice, in the city; for from the third century pilgrimages were made thither.

In 637 the Mohammedans, under Omar, took the city, which had already been venerated by Mohammed, called El Kuds ("the Sanctuary"), and considered by his followers second only to Mecca in holiness. Omar took the Church of the Virgin, which was a basilica, and transformed it into the Mosque El-Aksa. Later caliphs restored and remodelled it to its present condition. But the whole temple area has been altered by the Mohammedans. It is now called the Haram esh Sherif, and is an irregular parallelogram, on the west 1,001 feet, on the east 1,530, on the north 1,042, and on the south 922. In the middle stands the Kubet es-Sakhra ("the Dome of the Rock"), also called the Mosque of Omar, built by Abd el-Melek (A.D. 686), a large, stately octagonal building, sixty-seven feet each side. The interior is a hundred and forty-eight feet in diameter; entrance is by four doors. Under the dome is the famous rock, rising above the floor, surrounded by a railing. The Mohammedans suppose it to be suspended in the air, but it is merely the top of a cave. Many hold that the great altar of burnt-offering was built upon it. It is not mentioned in the Bible.

Jerusalem is ruled by the Turks, and is the seat of a mufti under the wali of Syria. Its present population consists of about twenty-four thousand, thus divided: Mohammedans, thirteen thousand; Christians, seven thousand; Jews, four thousand. The latter are supported by the charity of their co-religionists. Baron Rothschild's hospital, near the south wall, built in 1855, and Moses Montefiore's almshouses, west of the Birket es-Sultan, are their principal institutions. Every Friday at four p.m., and on festivals, many of the Jews gather to mourn the fall of the city, and to pray for its restoration, at the Wailing-Place, just outside the enclosure of the Mosque El-Aksa, and near Robinson's Arch, where a portion of the old temple wall is still uncovered.

The Christians belong to the Greek, old Armenian, and Latin, and a few to Protestant churches. The Greeks are the most numerous and powerful. They have over them a patriarch. The Russian cars have done much for them. There is a Russian colony outside the walls, near the Jaffa Gate, with a cathedral, hospital, and accommodations for a thousand pilgrims. The Armenians have a large convent inside the Jaffa Gate, where their patriarch and a hundred and eighty monks and brothers live; adjoining is the largest, and richest, garden in Jerusalem. They have also a printing-press and a photographic establishment. The Latins have only been numerous there since 1847. They number now fifteen hundred, have churches, convents, schools, and a printing-press, whence issued Arabic school-books. There is very few. Besides the church and school, which belong to the bishopric of Jerusalem (see next art. and GOBAT), there are German hospitals and an orphanage. There is also a lazaret.


JERUSALEM, The Episcopal See of St. James in. In 1818 the American Board of Foreign Missions sent two missionaries to Palestine to work among the Palestinian Jews, who, in the course of time, had sunk into spiritual degradation. After the occupation of the country by Mehemet Ali, in 1832, the London Association for Missionary Work among the Jews also entered the field; and in 1833 the celebrated Orientalist Nicolayson permanently settled in Jerusalem. Yet while the Greek, the Latin, and the Armenian churches had legally established organizations in Jerusalem, the Protestant churches were still without any official representation, until, by the joint expedition of the European grand powers in 1840, Friedrich Wilhelm IV. of Prussia opened negotiations with Queen Victoria for the establishment of a Protestant episcopal see in Jerusalem under the patronage of the two Protestant states,—England and Prussia. The Prussian propositions were most cordially accepted by the prelates of the Anglican Church, who spoke of the establishment as a great advantage for the missions among the Jews, and of its importance for the union between the Protestant churches in Germany and England. The dotation of the see was fixed at thirty thousand pounds, in order to insure a yearly income of twelve hundred pounds, of which England paid one half, and Prussia the other. With respect to jurisdiction, it was placed under the metropolitan authority of the bishop of Canterbury. The right of appointment...
was to be alternative between the two states, though the Archbishop of Canterbury retained a veto also in case of a Prussian appointment. The first bishop, Michael Sal. Alexander (b. in 1799 at Schönlanke in Posen), a converted Jew, was appointed by England, and entered Jerusalem Jan. 21, 1842, but died Nov. 23, 1845, near Cairo. The second (the present), Samuel Strasburger (art.), was appointed by Prussia. He occupied the see until his death, May 11, 1879, and founded twelve minor Protestant congregations in Palestine, with churches in Jerusalem, Nazareth, Jaffa, Bethlehelm, and Nablus, and with thirty-seven schools frequented by fifteen hundred children. The third bishop, Joseph Barclay, was appointed by England, and died Oct. 22, 1881. The fourth, G. F. P. Blyth, the present bishop, was appointed in 1887.

Chevalier Bunsen was the chief adviser of King William IV. in the scheme of founding the bishopric of St. James. The High-Church party in England was opposed to it on the ground that it interfered with the jurisdiction of the Greek Patriarch. The bishopric has disappointed the sanguine union-schemes of its founders, but is doing a good missionary work, especially in the education of youth, and in Christian charity to the poor and sick. Protestant services are held in English, German, and Hebrew. The English Church is near the Jaffa Gate and the Mediterranean Hotel, and is well filled during the Easter season.

Jerusalem, The Patriarchate of, owes its interest to the memories connected with the name and the place, rather than to the influence it has actually exercised on the history of the Church. Eusebius gives a list of the "bishops" from the origin of the congregation to his own time; but it contains only a few names of prominence. During the reign of Constantine the Great, the city began to attract the general attention of Christendom, especially by its relics. Magnificent churches were built within its precincts, and the Council of Nicaea (can. 7) conferred on it a precedence of honor as the true cradle of Christianity. The see of Christendom, thenceforward, until the metropolitan authority of Cæsarea until Theodosius II., elevated it into a patriarchate. Some difficulties arose with the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria concerning the boundaries of the new diocese; but they were solved by the Council of Chalcedon.


JERUSALEM, Synod of, 1672. The doctrines of Cyril Lucar were condemned by his successor at the Council of Constantinople, 1638, and again by the next patriarch of Constantinople, Parthenius, at the Synod of Jassy, 1642. The metropolitan of Kijew, Petrus Moglias, also found it necessary to protest against those doctrines; and his confession was sanctioned, 1643, by the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Moscow. Thus an effective barrier seemed to be raised against the Calvinistic invasions of the Orthodoxy of the Eastern Church. Nevertheless, both the Reformers and the Catholic theologians continued to hint that the Greek Church had given up its insulated attitude, and was leaning respectively either this or that way. In the controversy between the Reformed minister, Jean Claude, and the Jansenists Nicolle and Arnauld, concerning the Eucharist and transubstantiation, the former alleged, in support of his views, the dogma of the Eastern Church such as it appeared in its oldest form, and such as it had been revived by Cyril Lucar; while the latter appealed to the dogma of the Eastern Church in its ecumenical form. In 1490 the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Nectarius, published a book against Jean Claude; and in 1672 his successor, Dositheus, convened a synod at Jerusalem for the purpose of still further defending the Orthodoxy of the Eastern Church. The synod was frequented by sixty-eight representatives, and resulted in the so-called Shield of Orthodoxy (Schild der Orthodoxie), March 20, 1672,—one of the most important confessional works of the Eastern Church. The first part is historico-critical, and contains a strong condemnation of the views ascribed to Cyril Lucar,
and at the same time an adroit vindication of him personally, fatly denying that he ever held such opinions, ever wrote the books containing them, etc., as the second part is dogmatical, and presents a full confession of the Orthodox Greek faith in the form of a refutation of the theses of Cyril.

LIT.—The best editions of the acts of the synod are found in HARDuin: Conc., xi. p. 179 seq., and Kimchi: Mon. Jud., § 64. (See Tschudi: Gesch. des Judentums, 1850.)

RUD. HOFMANN.

JERUSALEM, Johann Friedrich Wilhelm, b. at Osnabrück, Nov. 22, 1708; studied at Leipzig, Leyden, and The Hague; resided for some time in London; and was in 1742 appointed court-preacher to the Duke of Brunswick, in 1743 provost of the monasteries of St. Crucis and St. Égidius, in 1749 abbot of Marienthal, in 1752 abbot of Riddagshausen, and in 1771 vice-president of the consistory of Wolfenbüttel, where he died Sept. 2, 1709. Besides several collections of poems, he published Betrachtungen über die vornehmsten Warheiten der Religion, 1768-79; which was translated into several foreign languages, and is considered one of the best apologitical works produced in the latter half of the eighteenth century. He was the father of that Jerusalem who by his suicide at Weizlar, in 1775, gave the occasion to Goethe's Leiden des jungen Werther.

HAGENBACH.

JERUSALEM CHAMBER, where met the Westminster Assembly in the seventeenth, and the revisers of the Authorized Version in the nineteenth century, is a large hall in the deanery of Westminster, London, hung with tapestries, mostly from Henry VIII.'s time, representing the circumcision, the adoration of the magi, and the passage through the wilderness, and furnished with a long table and chairs. It was built by Abbot Littlington, between 1376 and 1386, as a guest-room for the abbot's house. In it Henry IV. died (March 20, 1413) when on the eve of a pilgrimage to Jerusalem; and thus the prophecy that he should die in Jerusalem was supposed to be fulfilled (cf. Shakspeare: Henry IV., 2d part, act iv. sc. 4). Here Addison (1719) and Congreve (1729) lay in state before burial in the Abbey. The origin of the name is obscure. Some derive it from the pictures of Jerusalem on the tapestries; others (e.g., Dr. John Stoughton), from its adjoining the sanctuary, "the place of peace."

The Westminster Assembly adjourned thither at the close of September, 1643, because the room was well heated from its huge fireplace. The Lower House of Convocation now meets in the Jerusalem Chamber. See Dean STANLEY: Memorials of Westminster Abbey.

JESUITS. I. CONSTITUTION AND CHARACTER.—The Society of Jesus consists of four classes,—novices, scholastics, coadjutors, and professed. Novices are admitted only after a minute and searching examination of their character and social circumstances. The novitiate lasts for two years, which are spent in houses established for the special purpose. Time is there regulated from hour to hour. Reading, meditation, prayer, and devotional exercises, alternate with nursing in the hospitals, travels as beggars, menial services, and ascetic practices. A course of training is gone through which enables the novice to completely break his individual will, and prepares him to be a fit instrument for the will of the society. The term of probation ended, the member takes the three monastic vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, and enters one of the colleges of the society as a scholastic. There he studies grammar, rhetoric, and literature for two years, and philosophy, physics, and mathematics for three; teaches theology for three terms; and then enters the classes of the college for five or six years; studies theology for five or six years, and finally completes his education by going through another novitiate of spiritual exercises. The whole course of studies is very minutely prescribed. The oldest ratio studiorum dates from 1586. That agreed upon by the fifth congregation, and published in 1589, was in use until Roothaan, in 1832, introduced a new and reformed plan. After the second novitiate, the scholastic is ordained a priest, and becomes an active member of the society, either as coadjutor or professed, adding to the three common monastic vows the same new one that of zealous devotion to the education of the young, in the latter, that of undertaking any task which the Pope might see fit to confide to him. There are, however, besides the regular profesi quatuor ratorum, also some profesi trium ratorum; though it is not clear what thereby is meant, unless the expression refers to the so-called secret Jesuits.

At the head of the society stands a general (propositus generalis), who is represented in each province by a provincial (propositus provincialis), and in each individual establishment by a superior (propositus, or magister novitiorum, or rector). The general is elected for lifetime by the congregation; that is, the assembly of the professed, which meets ordinarily only for the purpose of electing the general. He holds in his hands the whole administration, jurisdiction, and government. He appoints the provincials and all other officials, generally only for a term of three years; he decides about admission to or expulsion from the order; he receives at fixed times reports from all the provincials and superiors; and he investigates the state of the various establishments by special inspectors; he can give dispensations from the rules just as he sees fit, etc. His power is absolute. He is to the order what the Pope is to the Church,—the representative of God. Indeed, the cemim which holds the whole fabric together is implicit obedience. To the inferior his superior is the Christ, before whose commandment he must cancel his own will, his own intellect, his own natural mode of feeling. Every trace of individuality must be obliterated, unless the superior chooses to develop and use it for purposes of the order. All Jesuits should at all times, and under all circumstances, hold the same physiognomy. No tossing of the head, no impatient movement of the hand, perfect composure, unmpeachable dignity. Slowly he raises his eyes from the ground when spoken to, and fixes them calmly on the lower part of the face of his interlocutor. Time is never frown, still less a sneer.

The informing idea of this finely-articulated organism is not the perfection of the inner life, but simply the performance of some external task. All that the order does for the education...
of its members and the elevation of their souls is done merely with an eye to some practical end. Science and art, religion and morals, are considered only as tools or weapons for the rehabilitation of medieval Catholicism and the establishment of the reign of the Church over the State. The order has produced quite a number of reputed scientists, though hardly any of first, or even second rank. Science has been an avocation to the Jesuits, and not the Jesuit. Whenever these two aims do not coincide, the Jesuit is compelled to leave science alone. He has succeeded best in those sciences which are most foreign to his own purpose, such as mathematics, chronology, interpretation of classical authors and ancient inscriptions; though in this last field he has been far surpassed by the Benedictines. On theology the order has exercised considerable influence. Medieval dogmatism developed in different directions: not only scholasticism and mysticism presented sharply opposed views, but also, within the pale of the former, various schools were formed. With the Reformation arose quite a number of expositions concerning the great question, — justification by faith, or justification by good works, forming a transition between Protestantism and Romanism. All these stand-points had their representatives at the Council of Trent; but it was the Jesuits Lainez and Salmeron who finally succeeded in deciding the debate, and driving the dogmatists of the Roman Church back into the stiftest and most barren scholasticism. The dogmatical stand-point of the order may be characterized as that most directly opposed to Protestantism. The general outlines are derived from Thomas Aquinas; but the details are evidently treated with the conscious aim of producing a contrast to Protestantism. An inclination towards Pelagianism is apparent, and everywhere prevailing. Luis Molina went even so far as to ascribe to the natural will of man the power of fitting itself for actions which all were used to consider as the effects of divine grace; and justification he defined as the result of the equal co-operation of grace and free will. Still more characteristic is the Jesuital system of morals. By its audacious unscrupulousness it finally drove the rock on which the fortunes of the order were wrecked; and very early its limitation of s i a t conscious and voluntary transgressions; its doctrines of probabilism; of methodus dirigenda intentionis, which leads directly to the maxim, the end justifies the means; of reseratio mentalis, which destroys all faith between man and man; of amphibleology, which may be made to cover any kind of falsehood, — made its adepts suspected, and even hated.

II. EARLY HISTORY, AND ACTIVITY DURING THE PERIOD OF RELIGIOUS RE-ACTION. — According to the ideas of the founder (see Ignatius Loyola), missions should be the true field of activity for the order,— foreign missions among the heathens, domestic missions within the pale of the Roman-Catholic Church, and missions for the conversion of the Protestants. The functions to which the members of the order had to adapt themselves were consequently teaching, and the Jesuits were conferred upon them to aid them in the fulfillment of their task. Paul III. gave them a right to preach everywhere,— in the churches and in the streets,— to administer the sacraments, to hear confession, and to give absolution in all cases except those mentioned in the bull "In censa Domini. By a bull of 1545 they were exempted from keeping the canonical hours, and afterwards, also, from participating in processions, and from other regulations infringing upon their time. Great obstacles, however, were also thrown in their way.

In Portugal they rapidly took root during the reign of John III. At Coimbra they founded their first college (1542), and Simon Rodriguez became its rector. The second they founded at Goa; and Francis Xavier made the Indian mission a great exploit. Under Sebastian, Rodriguez and the Jesuits actually governed the country. But in Spain they met with decided opposition from Melchior Canus, from the royal chaplain and librarian, Arias Montanus, and from others. Even Philip II. declared that the Society of Jesus was the only ecclesiastical institution he did not understand; and he continued maintaining a reserved attitude towards them, even after seeing them at work in Belgium. The country was half Protestant when they entered it in 1542: it was exclusively Roman Catholic, when, half a century later on (1592), they pushed their outposts farther on into the United Netherlands.

Still greater difficulties they encountered in France, where for a long time they were looked upon with suspicion and antipathy. In 1540 Ignatius sent some young men to Paris to study; but in 1542, when the war with Spain broke out, they were compelled to leave the country. In the Cardinal of Lorraine the order found an energetic patron, but all his exertions in its behalf were baffled by the decided opposition of the Parliament of Paris and the Sorbonne. At the convention of Poissy, where he was present in person (1561), Lainez succeeded in getting admission for the order, but only on very precarious conditions. Thus it had to change its name, and call itself, after its residency in Paris, College Clermont. Its first stable and flourishing establishment in France it founded at Lyons. One of its priests, Edmond Angier, produced by his preaching such an excitement in that vicinity, that all Reformed ministers were expelled, all Reformed churches destroyed, and all Reformed books burned. As a monument of this great victory, the Roman-Catholic population built the order a magnificent college in the city. As the great task of the Jesuits in France was to stamp out the Reformation there, and rid the country of the Hugenots, they were naturally opposed to Henry IV., and intrigued against him, even after his conversion to Romanism. The result was, that they were expelled by the Parliament of Paris. They succeeded, however, in maintaining themselves in the circuits of the two southern parliaments, and they soon came to understand that they could do nothing, unless in alliance with the king. From that moment they labored zealously for a reconciliation between the king and the Pope; and afterwards, during the embroilments with Spain, they even espoused the interests of France. As a reward, Henry IV. gave them a right to lecture at the re-established college of the university, the College Clermont permission to teach, not only theology, but also the
other sciences (1610), and he chose a Jesuit, Father Cotton, for his confessor. This was a great victory. At the same time, however, they suffered a great loss in a neighboring country. In Venice they were bitterly opposed by Fra Paolo Sarpi; and when, in 1568, Paul V. placed the republic under the interdict, they left the territory, together with the Theatines and Capuchins. But, when a reconciliation was brought about between the Pope and the republic, the latter made it a condition that the Jesuits should not be allowed to return, and even the Spanish ambassador had not a word to say in their favor.

The two countries, however, in which they achieved their greatest successes, and suffered their greatest losses, were England and Germany. The biographies of William Allen, Perron, Campan, and others, give an idea of their exertions in England. In the country they were established in a magnificent college at the Savoy, London, and Father Edward Petro was made the private secretary of the king. But the result was the loss of the crown of England to the House of Stuart.

In Germany, on the contrary, the really successful efforts in producing a reaction which actually turned back the current of the Reformation. The first Jesuit, Le Jay, appeared in Germany in 1550, at the diet of Augsburg. He obtained permission from King Ferdinand to found a college in Vienna, and in 1551 fifteen Jesuits entered the Austrian capital. In 1552 Ignatius founded the Collegium Germanicum, for the education of German youths as missionaries; and in 1556 similar establishments were founded at Cologne and Ingolstadt, together with a school for young noblemen at Prague, to which the king sent his pages. In 1559 the Jesuits arrived at Munich, which city they soon transformed into a "German Rome;" and during the next years they spread rapidly along the Rhine and the Main, — Treves, Mayence, Spire, Aschaffenburg, Würzburg, etc.

The influence of their universities began to be felt as a counterpoise to that of the universities of Wittenberg and Geneva, and their schools were greatly admired on account of the consistent method of the teachers and the sure progress of the pupils. Even Protestants sent their children thither; and through his pupils the teacher noiselessly penetrated into the Protestant family, with fasts, rosaries, prayers to the Virgin, etc., following in his step. Very soon the order felt prepared to use force as a means of conversion, and consequently force was used. Duke Albert V. of Bavaria gave his Protestant subject the choice of Baden, a minor, he extended the measures also to that country. Thus supported, the Jesuits accomplished the "reformation" of the two countries in 1570 and 1571. The example was followed in Cologne, Münster, Illéshem, Paderborn, Würzburg, and other places. In Austria the counter-reformation began in 1575. Consecration, exile, torture, etc., were the instruments. In 1603 the task was completed, and the workmen went to Bohemia and Hungary. The former country was entirely lost to Protestantism; in the latter, the progress of the Reformation was stopped.

III. DECAY AND DISSOLUTION. — After Ignatius Loyola, followed, as generals of the order, Jacob Lainez (1558—65), Francis Borgia (1565—72), Eberhard Mercurian (1572—81), Claudius Aquaviva (1581—1615), etc. During this period various attempts were made by the popes to alter the constitution. The monarchical organization of the society gave to the general a tremendous and, as it would seem, even dangerous power. Paul IV. demanded that the general should be elected, not for life, but only for three years; and Pius V., that the number of professed should be increased; and a steady influence on the government consented to the congregation. Foreign monarchs, the kings of Spain and France, had the same misgivings with respect to the order, and renounced with the Pope for an alteration of its constitution. Yes, denunciations of tyranny arose even from among its own members. (See Maria.)

Unable to wield the tremendous power which they lived in comfort and splendor; and gradually the weakness of the centre transfused itself through the whole body. The professed followed the example of the general. From a phalanx of heroes, ready at any time to any sacrifice, they changed into a swarm of intriguing diplomats, beset with all the vices of ambition and delusion. The ecclesiastical and educational functions of the order were left to the performance of young and inexperienced people; and the schools, once admired as model institutions of their kind, became dens of disorder and vice. Novices were admitted without due discrimination, mostly with an eye to their fortune; and when dotations grew scarce, while at the same time the needs and expenses of the order greatly increased, the order decided to engage in business. Commercial houses were established, and factories built, in all the most important parts of the empire, and the Jesuits transformed into a kind of banking-house, and undertakings of unparalleled magnitude were begun.

Thus the order changed character, and so did the world around it, but on the opposite principle; so that, the less the order was ready to give, the more the world insisted upon having. In their controversy with the Jansenists, in the middle of the seventeenth century, though the Jesuits succeeded in silencing their adversaries, they nevertheless suffered a severe defeat; for it was the ideas of the Jansenists which kept the ground when the battle was ended: and the odium and ridicule which had been thrown upon the Jesuits went on increasing, though fed by no visible hand. In the Chinese mission affair their moral reputation was much damaged. It seemed doubtful whether it was the Jesuits who had converted the Chinese, or the Chinese who had converted the Jesuits, to such an extent that the missionaries modified Christianity, and amalgamated it with heathen elements. Europe stood scandalized, and it came to an open breach with the Pope. Still worse fared their intellectual fame under the attacks of the Encyclopedists. They were represented as the true type of obscurantism, and
condemned as the most dangerous and most contemptible remnants of an entirely antiquated and inadequate state of affairs; and they had nothing to offer in its stead. Under such circumstances, they were at once implicated in the most vehement contests with the governments of Portugal, France, Spain, and Italy.

In 1750 Portugal and Spain made an exchange of certain territories in South America; but the inhabitants, who were known to walk blindly by the strings of their Jesuit priests and teachers, offered resistance, and met in the field, provided with European arms. It took eight years to put down the rebellion. Moreover, the great mercantile privileges and monopolies which the Jesuits held in Portugal caused continuous disturbances and losses to the commerce of the country; and as the complaints of Marquis Pombal in Rome had no effect, but were answered with an assault on the life of the king, the order was expelled Sept. 3, 1759. Its property was confiscated, and its members were shipped to the States of the Church. In 1760 Father Lavalle, procurator of the order, directed the establishment of manufactory establishments in the Island of Martinique, and a resident of France, made a heavy failure, of two million four hundred thousand livres; and the order refused to pay the debt, laying all responsibility on the shoulders of its procurator. The case was brought before the Parliament of Paris; and the examination of the constitution of the order, thereby occasioned, showed, that, in many points, it came in conflict with the constitution of France. For this reason the Parliament declared the society dissolved Aug. 9, 1762; and, after some haggling between the king and the Parliament, a royal decree of December, 1764, enforced the dissolution. On account of participation in conspiracies against the Spanish Government, all Jesuits, not only in Spain, but also in the Spanish colonies, were arrested during the night of March 31, 1767, and sent to Italy. Neither the Pope nor the general would receive them. After wandering about for several days on the open sea in overcrowded vessels, they were allowed to land in Corsica. Similar measures were introduced in Naples, Nov. 5, 1767, and Parma, Feb. 7, 1768; and when Pope Clement XIII. tried to come to the rescue of the order, and launched a bull of excommunication against its weakest enemy, the Duke of Parma, the French ambassador in Rome declared, Dec. 10, 1768, in the name of France, Spain, Portugal, Naples, and Parma, that, if the Pope did not retract, war would immediately be waged against him. This declaration literally killed Clement XIII.; but his successor, Clement XIV., dissolved the society by the bull Dominus ac Redemptor noster, July 21, 1773. The general, Lorenzo Ricci, was imprisoned in the Castle of St. Angelo, where he died in 1775. Clement XIV. died in 1774 from poison.

Under the new instructions, the first attempt at dissolution began, the order had 41 provinces, 22,589 members (of whom 11,295 were priests), 969 colleges, 176 seminaries, 61 houses for novices, 273 missions in foreign countries, 335 residences, and the controlling influence over 80 theological faculties.

IV. ATTEMPTS AT RESTITUTION.—After the dissolution of the order, some of its members joined the Fathers of the Faith, or the Clerks of the Sacred Heart, or the Redemptorists; while others, on the plea that a papal bull has no authority in a dominion which lies outside of the jurisdiction of the Pope, retired into Prussia and Russia, and continued the society in its old forms, and after its old rules. Friedrich II. favored them: he hoped in them to find the best and cheapest schoolmasters for Silesia. Catherine II. even flattered them: she needed them for her further designs with respect to Poland. She confirmed their deeds of property in Russia, and in 1782 they chose a Pole to be their vicar-general. In 1800 they received the Roman-Catholic cathedral in St. Petersburg, and permission to found a college there; and by a brief of March 7, 1801, Pius VII. officially recognized the restitution of the order in Russia, and conferred the dignity of general on its chief. In 1804 King Ferdinand IV. of the Two Sicilies asked the Pope for the restoration of the order in his kingdom, and Pius VII. was only too glad to grant the request; but, as Naples was occupied by the French from 1806 to 1815, only the Island of Sicily could avail itself of the advantage. Finally, when, after the fall of Napoleon, Pius VII. returned to Rome, he summoned back the Jesuits, opened the Church of Gesù to them, and completely restored the order, "in accordance with the unanimous wishes of Christendom," as he said in the bull Solicitude omnium ecclesiaram, of Aug. 7, 1814.

This "unanimity," however, proved a mistake. In Russia, where Alexander I., in 1812, gave their college at Polotsk the rank of a university, and bestowed other great privileges on them, the Jesuits began to make proselytes among the members of the Russian Church, and to intrigue against the Bible Society, one of the emperor's favorite institutions. As a warning, they were banished from St. Petersburg and Moscow, Jan. 1, 1815. But they needed not the warning: on the contrary, they tried their proselytizing talent even on the Russian army; and March 25, 1820, they were banished from the country "forever." Into Spain they were admitted by Ferdinand VII.; but when, in the civil war which broke out after his death (1833), they sided with Don Carlos, their college in Madrid was stormed by the people, July 17, 1834; and they were expelled by the regent, Queen Christina, July 4, 1835. In Portugal they sided with Dom Miguel, and were expelled (May 24, 1834) by Dom Pedro. In France they never obtained a legal position; but they were tolerated and even favored by Louis XVIII. and Charles X.

At Lyons they founded a very flourishing college. They made their influence strongly felt on the whole middle stage of education,—that is, the stage between the elementary and the scientific education; and their number rose to four hundred and thirty-six, when the revolution of 1830 suddenly swept them out of the country. Under Louis Philippe they returned, and Vigan became the most fashionable preacher in Paris; but the popular animosity against them—brought to its highest pitch by E. Sue's romance, The Wandering Jew—compelled, in 1845, their own general, Roothaan, to recall them. Indeed, in the only country which they really succeeded in bringing under their sway was Belgium. They were among the most prominent agents in the
JESUS CHRIST. Our purpose in this article is to give a brief abstract of the history of the earthly activity of God our Saviour, with which we will combine a short consideration of the sources of this history, its chronology, and the literature.

I. Documentary Sources. — The sources of the history of Jesus are usually distinguished into biblical and extra-biblical, but in truth we can only speak of biblical sources. The notices of Tacitus, Suetonius, Pliny, and of the later authors, Lampridius, Lucian, and Celsus, afford little matter, and hardly deserve a place in this category; and the Syriac letter of the Pagan Mara to his son Serapion, written about 73 A.D. (ed. by Cureton, in Spicilegium Syriacum, Lond., 1855), is at best an interesting witness to the spiritual power of Christianity at the end of the apostolic age. The letters of Abgar of Edessa, and the reply of Jesus, preserved by Eusebius (H. E., I. 13), would be exceedingly valuable, were they not unguenuine. Turning to the extra-biblical sources of Jewish origin, we have the apocryphal Gospels. The oldest and best of these, the so-called Hebrew Gospel, is very deficient in originality, compared with Matthew, and contains a profusion of historical inventions (Keim). The apocryphal Gospels were written between the second and seventh centuries, and were fantastic attempts to fill up the gaps in the life of our Lord, especially in the periods of his infancy, childhood, and passion, and are only valuable for the contrast they present to the canonical Gospels. The attempts of Lentulus to describe the appearance of Christ, the brass statue of Christ and the woman with the issue of blood at Paneas, described by Eusebius, belong to a still lower plane. Of more value are the descriptions some of the Fathers of the first two centuries give of Christ's experiences and words; as particularly the account which the Eusebian Epitome of Barnabas gives of the battles (5), the resurrection and ascension (15), etc. Extra-biblical accounts of Jewish origin might be expected in the writings of Philo and Josephus. The former, an Alexandrian Jew, completely ig-

revolution which separated Belgium from Holland; and, when the former was constituted an independent kingdom, they took possession of it as a conquered province, and domineered for some time, not only in the Church and the school, but even in the civil administration and the court.

One of the ideas of the revolution of 1848 proved very favorable to the Jesuits,— the separation of Church from State, and the seminary and university of Vienna, whose students were not slow in availing themselves of the circumstance. In 1849 the Roman-Catholic bishops of Prussia demanded, in the name of the revolution, free communication with Rome, full power of discipline within their Church, right of appointing priests and other ecclesiastical officers, unconditional power over the administration of the property of the Church, supervision of all religious instruction in the schools, the seminaries, and the universities, etc. Friedrich Wilhelm IV. yielded in nearly all the points, and through the breach thus opened the Jesuits stole into the country. By the concordat of Aug. 18, 1855, between Austria and the Pope, the order came into possession of the colleges of Linz, Leitmeritz, and Innsbruck, and in 1857 also of the academy and university of Vienna, whose students and professors were forced to hear sermons by the Jesuits every Sunday. In 1858 they directed a hundred and seventy-two out of the two hundred and fifty-six gymnasiums in Austria. But in these great successes the declaration of the dogma of papal infallibility made a fearful havoc. July 31, 1870, Austria cancelled the concordat; and there, as in Italy, the influence of the Jesuits is steadily on the wane, though they have not yet been expelled. In Germany the papal infallibility dogma caused the Kulturkampf; and by the law of July 4, 1872, the Jesuits were banished. A similar fate overtook them in France, where they had played a conspicuous role during the second empire: the Ferry laws drove them out of the country. In 1878 the order had 10,033 members, of whom 4,660 were priests, 2,679 scholastics, and 2,649 coadjutors. In England, where Thomas Weld of Sylworth Castle established them (at Stonyhurst, in 1799), the have several establishments, and are fantastic attempts to fill up the gaps in the life of our Lord, especially in the periods of his infancy, childhood, and passion, and are only valuable for the contrast they present to the canonical Gospels. The attempts of Lentulus to describe the appearance of Christ, the brass statue of Christ and the woman with the issue of blood at Paneas, described by Eusebius, belong to a still lower plane. Of more value are the descriptions some of the Fathers of the first two centuries give of Christ's experiences and words; as particularly the account which the Eusebian Epitome of Barnabas gives of the battles (5), the resurrection and ascension (15), etc. Extra-biblical accounts of Jewish origin might be expected in the writings of Philo and Josephus. The former, an Alexandrian Jew, completely ig-
nores Christ and John the Baptist. The celebrated passage of Josephus (Antiq., XIII. 3, 3) hardly deserves to be regarded as genuine, although it is found in all the manuscripts, and is noticed by Eusebius (H. E., II. 11). At all events, it is not genuine as it now stands. The references to Christ's superhuman nature, resurrection, etc., betray the hand of an early Christian interpolator. Paulus, Olshausen, Gieseler, Hase, Reuss, Ewald, and others, hold this view,—that the passage has been tampered with, but is in part from the hand of Josephus. After the middle of the second century, the Jewish writings took notice of Jesus, but only to malign his character. Celsus and Porphyry both drew from these sources. He was described as the child of an adulterous connection of his mother with the soldier Panthera, as having been trained by Egyptian sorcerers in all kinds of magical arts, etc. These malicious falsehoods were collected in the Talmud and in the Book of the Origins of Jesus Hannosai.

The student of the life of Jesus of Nazareth is, therefore, almost exclusively shut up to the New Testament, especially the Gospels. In spite of the attacks of modern criticism, these four biographies are generally acknowledged to be genuine, the first three dating from the period preceding the destruction of Jerusalem (70). Each has its own characteristics. Matthew depicts Christ as the promised Messiah and the son of David. Mark portrays him as the Son of God, who established his Messianic mission by miraculous deeds. Luke describes him as the Saviour and revealer of truth, sent from God to save and enlighten all peoples. John differs very materially from the other evangelists, by exhibiting more of the inner life and thoughts of Christ. The other writings of the New Testament are very valuable as witnesses to the truth of the gospel narratives and their picture of Christ which they presuppose. They corroborate many individual traits, the Acts giving an account of the ascension (i. 4–11) and an otherwise unrecorded saying of our Lord (xx. 35); while Paul makes a valuable addition to the history of the days succeeding the resurrection (1 Cor. xvi. 8–3). The writers of the New Testament agree in their testimony to the reality of the revelation of God in Christ; and their narrative lays claim to our respect in proportion as it can stand alone, and does not need any illustration from the dull and flickering light of the apocryphal inventions.

II. LIFE OF JESUS. 1. Pedigree, Birth, and Infancy.—Jesus was descended from David (Matt. i. 6; Luke iii. 29). His contemporaries recognized this pedigree (Matt. xv. 22, xx. 30); and Paul (Rom. i. 3) and the Epistle to the Hebrews (vii. 14) assume it as a thing generally acknowledged. Both Matthew and Luke agree in representing him as being conceived by the Holy Ghost. He was born, not in the town of Nazareth, where Joseph and Mary resided, but in Bethlehem. Thus the prophecy of Micah (v. 2) was fulfilled. There was no room in the inn; and Jesus, the priestly King of Israel, and the world's Redeemer, was born, probably, in a cave or grotto, and laid in a manger. Shepherds, led by angels, were the first witnesses to his birth. The child was circumcised on the eighth day, according to the Mosaic custom. Witnesses soon appeared to the divine mission of the child, in those who were waiting for the kingdom of God, such as Anna the prophetess, and Simeon at the temple. Wise men from the East (Matt. ii. 1–12), led by a startling sign in the heavens, also came to adore the child. King Herod regarded with suspicion the young scion of royal descent, and by his murderous plans his parents were led to flee into Egypt, from which, when they returned, they went to live in Nazareth. These narratives of the infancy have been discredited by the modern critical school; but they stand in the strongest contrast to those of the apocryphal Gospels; and much in the accounts both of Matthew and Luke, instead of being of the nature of legendary reminiscences (Beyerschlag), seems to have come from eye-witnesses.

2. Development, Baptism, and Temptation.—During the years spent at Nazareth, Jesus advanced in wisdom, and stature, and in favor with God and men" (Luke ii. 52). In all this development he remained absolutely without sin, and was triumphant over every temptation (John viii. 48; 2 Cor. v. 21, etc.). He in whom dwelt "all the fulness of Deity" (Col. ii. 9) lived and died as the son of a carpenter, and was himself called "the carpenter" (Mark iii. 28). The religious arrangements of the synagogue must have contributed to his religious development. In the synagogues the influence of the Pharisees was supreme; but it is evident that Jesus in no wise became identified with them, or their instructions, or he could not have subsequently directed so many scathing rebukes against the "Pharisees and scribes." But he must have studied the Old-Testament Scriptures. When he began his ministry, he was able to teach with authority, and not as the scribes (Matt. vii. 29). His baptism by John also contributed to prepare him to inaugurate his public activity in the spirit of a divine consciousness. He who was without sin submitted to the water-baptism of repentance (Matt. iii. 15), in humble obedience to the law (Matt. iii. 15) and voluntary condensation. But he received at the Jordan the anointing of the Holy Spirit, and was declared by God to be his well-beloved Son. John, who up to this time had not known Jesus as the Messiah, now instructed of the heavenly voice, recognized him as the "Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world" (John i. 29). Jesus here became fully conscious of his Messianic mission, but was immediately led by the "Spirit into the wilderness, to be tempted of the devil" (Matt. iv. 1, etc.). He resisted, one after another, the three temptations, of which he, at a later period, spoke to his disciples, and which ministered to his angels. It was not till after this conflict with the prince of this world that he inaugurated his public activity in the world, for the purpose of establishing his kingdom in it. From this time forth he manifested forth his higher gifts and powers, and in the first instance with the design of establishing the nucleus of the Church.

3. Plan and Method of the Messianic Activity of Jesus.—The hypothesis that Jesus had a definite plan before his mind when he began his public activity has been given up by some modern theologians (Schleiermacher, Ullmann, Kahnis, etc.); but, if it be allowed that the purpose and end of his life was revealed to Jesus by the Spirit at his baptism, then it is proper to speak of his having
had a definite Messianic plan. Our Lord himself seems to declare this, in an indirect way, in parables (Luke xiv. 28-33), and in discourse to his disciples of his hour, which had not yet come (John ii. 4), of the bread of life (John vi. 51), etc. The majority of the parables about the kingdom of heaven show a progress of ideas, and indicate the same thing. The main periods of his public activity are the Galilean ministry, lasting more than two years; a ministry of four months, beginning with the mission of the seventy, and spent between Galilee and Judaea; and the last fifty days, lasting from the beginning of the passion-week to the ascension. The methods which Jesus used during these three periods were substantially the same. A distinction is justly made between his miraculous and teaching activity; but it must not be overlooked that many of the miracles had a deep symbolical meaning (as the restoration of the blind to sight), and that Jesus frequently followed the working of a miracle with words of instruction. The miracles must be regarded as sustaining an intimate connection with his divine-human personality. They were not mere evidences for overcoming unbelief, but were signs of the higher Messianic life of Christ, and prophetic pledges of the glorious future of the kingdom of heaven. From this point of view the miraculous activity was a necessary accompaniment of all the three periods of his life. The form and contents of the teaching of Jesus changed to this extent, that, in the earlier part of the Galilean ministry, there was more of legal precept, but later more of prophecy and promise. The discourses preserved by the synoptists are predominantly parabolic and gnomic; those preserved by John, allegorical and symbolic. The synoptists contain more of teaching about Christ (doctrina Christi); John, more of the teaching of Christ (doctrina de Christo).

4. The Galilean Ministry. — (a) Cooperation with John the Baptist. The ministry of Jesus was not yet concentrated in Galilee. John alone gives an account of the incidents of this period before the imprisonment of the Baptist, which Mark (i. 14) and Matthew (iv. 12) mention as the occasion for his going to the region of the Jordan (John iv. 4). Much that belongs here and because it is some-what doubtful whether the passover of John vi. 4 is the only one that fell in this period. The main incidents were as follows: after being rejected at Nazareth (Mark i. 21 sqq.; Luke i. 17 sqq.), where he performed a number of miracles. Here belongs the choice of the disciples in the stricter sense (Matt. iv. 18-22, etc.), followed by the solemn instructions of Matt. v.-vii. (Mark iii. 13; Luke vi. 17 sqq.). Between this Sermon on the Mount and the mission of the twelve (Matt. x. 1 sqq.) occurred many remarkable cures, such as the centurion's servant (Matt. viii. 5-13; Luke vii. 1-10), and other miracles, such as the stilling of the storm on Lake Galilee. Here, also, belongs the raising of Jairus' daughter (Matt. ix. 29-27), and that of the dead son of Nain (Luke vii. 11-17), which must have occurred soon afterwards. Matthew places at this time the discourses and parables of chaps. xii., xiii., which Mark and Luke break up into parts, and give in other connections. But the three synoptists agree again in their accounts of the miracle of the five loaves, and the walking on the lake, which they put in connection with the news of the Baptist's decapitation. John also joins in with the synoptists at this point. (c) The Last Summer in Galilee. — This period is marked by a growing conflict with the unbelieving Galileans, who have forgotten their once enthusiastic, and especially with the Pharisees. This opposition obliges Jesus to retire frequently to desert-places, and even to pass at times beyond the confines of Galilee. The period lasts from the passover of John vi. 4 to the feast of tabernacles (John vii. 2); that is, through the summer and fall. Among the main incidents were the condemnation of the Pharisees (Matt. xv. 1-20), the visits to the regions of Tyre and Sidon and Caesarea Philippi, the confession of Peter, the first definite announcement of the crucifixion (Matt. xvi. 13-23), the transfiguration, the journey to the feast of tabernacles (John vii. 8-10), and the presentation of the child as an illustration of fitness for the kingdom of heaven (Matt. xviii. 1 sqq.).

5. The Extra-Galilean Ministry. — During the winter months previous to the passion. Luke (ix. 51-xviii. 30) gives the most elaborate account of this period; but all three synoptists (Mark x. 1, 32; Matt. xix. 1) agree in describing the last departure of Christ from Galilee as a particularly important and solemn event. Jesus set his face towards Jerusalem, but first touched upon Samaria (Luke ix. 52-59), and labored in Peræa (Matt. ix. 1; Mark x. 1). The mission of the seventy belongs here (Luke x. 1-20). Much that Luke narrates in these chapters may not be put in chronological order; but it is likely that Jesus repeated some of his discourses, as the model prayer (Luke xi. 1 sqq.). John mentions some of the journeys of Jesus to Jerusalem at this period, to the feast of tabernacles (x. 22-29), to Bethany at the death of Lazarus (xi. 7 sqq.), and to the last passover (xi. 54). We do not pretend to be able to arrange in more definite chronological sequence the incidents and
discourses of Luke ix.—xviii. Besides running parallel with Luke at this point, in some cases Matthew and Mark add, towards the close of the period, the reply of the Master to the question about divorce (Matt. xix. 1-12; Mark x. 2-12), the parable of the laborers in the vineyard (Matt. xx. 1-10), and the conversation with the mother of John and James (Matt. xx. 20; Mark x. 35). On the other hand, John describes the raising of Lazarus from the dead (xi. 1 sqq.), and the retirement of Jesus to Ephraim to escape the murderous plans of the rulers of the people (xi. 54 sqq.).

6. The Passion and the Resurrection. — The Pharisees and chief priests, who had been enraged, by the resurrection of Lazarus, against the Galilean prophet, now witnessed a growing enthusiasm on the part of the people in his favor. In Jericho he healed Bartimaeus, and was the guest of Zaccheus. At Bethany he was appointed by Mary with costly nard, which was the occasion for Judas to murmur, and to protest against his speedy death (John xii. 1-11, etc.). On the following day, Sunday, he entered Jerusalem, amidst the hosannas of the people, who hailed him as the Messianic king (John xii. 12-19, etc.). He spent the following nights at Bethany, and the days in teaching at the temple or by the way-side, or in disputing with the representatives of Phariseeism and Sadduceeism. After spending Wednesday at Bethany, he despatched Peter and John to Jerusalem to prepare the passover, which he partook of with his disciples on Thursday (see below). In the account of this general scene, the synoptists linger upon the institution of the Lord's Supper, while John dwells upon the introductory act of the foot-washing and the consolatory discourses and prayer which followed the institution. All four evangelists detail the recognition and departure of the traitor, and the prediction of Peter's denial. Then followed the departure to Gethsemane and the agony (narrated only by the synoptists), the approach of the Sanhedrin, which might confirm the death-penalty of the Sanhedrin (John xii. 24-29). Four other appearances are narrated (the appearance of 1 Cor. xv. 7 being, as is probable, the same as that described in Matt. xxvii. 51, etc.), at the last of which, on the Mount of Olives, near Jerusalem, he was received up into heaven (Acts i. 9-11; compare Luke xxiv. 51; Mark xvi. 19).

III. Chronology of the Life of Christ. 1. Day and Year of Birth. — There are six dates in the Gospels which are of greater or less value in fixing the time of the Saviour's entrance into the world. (a) The birth of Christ, fixed in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius (752 or 753 of Rome), would give 753 or 754 of the city of Rome as the year of the birth. Basing his calculations upon a comparison of these notices, Dionysius Exiguus, in the sixth century, fixed the chronology of Christ's life, which has since had general currency in the Church; and the 25th of December has been accepted since the fourth century as the day of the birth. The precariousness of this calculation becomes, however, apparent, when we remember that Christ is only said to have been "about thirty years of age," and the difficulty of determining the point from which the reign of Tiberius is to be reckoned as having begun. (b) The notice of John ii. 20, that the temple had been forty-six years in building, has also been used, but does not give any exact results. (c) The same may be said concerning the enrolment under Quirinius (Luke ii. 2), which was the occasion of Joseph's journey to Jerusalem. (d) We get a better datum from the service of the priestly course of Abijah, to which Zacharias belonged (Luke i. 5). This was the eighth of the twenty-four courses which served in the temple a week at a time. We know that the evening before the destruction of Jerusalem (9th Ab, 823 of the city of Rome), the first course began its service. This would give us the 17th to the 22d of April, or the 9th to the 15th of October, of 754, as the time when Zacharias had the vision of the angel. Jesus' birth, occurring fifteen months thereafter, would have happened in 749, or five years before the beginning of our present era. This calculation is based upon the supposition that there had been no interruption in the sequence and ministration of the priestly courses from the time of Judas Maccabaeus to the destruction of Jerusalem. (e) Of most value is the calculation which starts out with the date of Herod's death in 750 of Rome (Josephus). The king died soon after the command to destroy the children of Bethlehem (Matt. ii. 16). This would give us 749, or 4-5 B.C., as the year of Christ's birth. (f) Another calculation has been based upon astronomical facts compared with the star of the magi. Kepler, in his De Jesu Christi vero anno natalitio (1606), took up this method, and found that a conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn, which rose in the early morning of the third day. He appeared first to Mary Magdalene, then to Peter, and during the afternoon to two disciples on their way to Emmaus, and in the evening to ten of his disciples. Eight days later, on the first day of the week, he appeared again to the disciples. The tradition of this appearance is first found in the apocryphal work of the Fourth Evangelist, in 1572, or in Ophiuchus, in 1604. Wieseler and others looked upon it as a comet. This calculation would also give us 4 or 5 B.C. as the year of
Christ's birth. The date cannot be fixed with absolute definiteness; but it may be regarded as reasonably certain that it fell about halfway between 747 and 753 of the city of Rome.

2. Duration of the Public Ministry.—John expressly mentions two passovers as occurring during Christ's life. The first (John ii. 20) happened in 780 of Rome, Jesus having begun his ministry the autumn before. The second passover is mentioned in connection with the feeding of the five thousand (John vi. 4). The synoptists speak of only one passover for the whole period of the ministry, and would seem, for this reason, to regard it as having lasted only one year. This was the view of many of the early Fathers, who added in confirmation the expression, "the acceptable year of the Lord" (Isa. lix. 2; Luke iv. 19). Keim has recently revived this theory; but it is inconsistent with some expressions in the synoptists themselves, as the last words over Jerusalem (Mark xii. 37, etc.). The poetic treatment of the Lord's Supper by John, xiii. 34), the intimate relations with the family at Bethany, which seem to call for frequent visits to it (compare Luke x. 38 sqq. with Mark xi. 11 sq.), etc. Two passovers, then, occurred during the Lord's public ministry, and a third at its close, which therefore lasted from two years and a half to three years. This conclusion rests upon the view that the feast of John v. I was not a passover, as Ireneus, Luther, Grotius, Tholuck, etc., held, but one of the other Jewish feasts. Jesus began his ministry in the summer or fall of 29 A.D. (770 R.), and was crucified in the spring of 29 A.D. (762 R.).

3. Day of the Crucifixion.—The evangelists agree in describing the crucifixion as having occurred on Friday. The universal tradition of the first day of the passover, or the 15th of Nisan, and clearly the autumn before. The second assoverismen agreed in describing the crucifixion as having ocurred on Friday. The universal tradition of the first day of the passover, or the 15th of Nisan. See, for the arguments, Ross (xx. 17), an early church tradition (Ep. of Barnabas, c. 15), Kinkel, Greve (D. Himmelcunft unseres Herrn, etc., Hanover, 1888), and others, have assumed that there were repeated ascensions.

Lit. —(Compare especially the extensive treatment of Hase, in his Geschicde Jesu, pp. 110—174).

1. The early Church did not attempt an historical treatment of Christ's life in the real sense, but contented itself with poetical representations and labors on the Harmony of the Gospels. The oldest Harmonies are those of Tatian (about 170), Ammonius of Alexandria (about 220), and the later imitations of Bishop Victor of Capua (about 550). The poetic representations continue. Of the latter we mention the Harmony of Victor of Capua in the nineteenth century (ed. Schmeller, Vienna, 1841), and the Moniessaron of Gerson (Cologne, 1471), which was based upon thorough investigations, and almost inspired by a critical spirit. They also produced poetical treatments at the beginning of the period in epic verse, like that of the Saxon Cædmon (about 680), the Heliand (about 820), and the one by Otfrid (in rhyme), and, towards the close, in dramatic verse, — the passion plays. The middle ages gave birth to the first Lives of Christ for practical purposes, and enriched with legendary matter,—Bona ventura: Vita Christi, first written in Portuguese, then translated into Persian for missionary purposes of edification were published within the pale of the Roman-Catholic Church by Martin v. Cochem (3d ed., Regensburg, 1862), and the Duddlather Alice Emmrich (d. 1824), D. butte Leiden s. Herrn J. Christi, new edition, Regens-
burb, 1858; and within the Protestant Church, in England, by JEREMY TAYLOR (London, 1653), READING (London, 1718; new ed., 1852), [JOHN FLEETWOOD (about 1770)]; and in German by CREUTZBERG (1714), BOGATZKY (1754), etc. A large number of works of this class in the latter part of the century by SCHULER, NÖSSLIT, MARHEINECKE, V. AMMON (the last two in the form of the so-called critical method, which began to be practised at the beginning of the eighteenth century, was first used in the interest of sheer negations of the historical credibility of the Gospel history by the Deists of England.—Woolston, Chubb, and others. Introduced into Germany, it was applied by REIMARIUS (d. 1708): Fragmenta eines Ungenannten (edited by Lessing), 1777; BAHRDIT: Briefe u. d. Bibel, etc., Halle, 1782, and Ausführung d. Planes Jesus, 12 vols., Berlin, 1784 sqq. (Jesus hostile to Christianity); VENTURINI: Natürliche Gesch. d. grossen Propheten u. Nazaren, Copenhagen, 1780-82, Bahrdt and Venturini to some extent a ply the principles of the so-called naturalistic method of explaining the miracles; but it afterwards found its chief representative in Paulus (d. 1851), in his Commentaries on the Gospels, and in his Life of Jesus, Heidelberg, 1828, 2 vols. These hostile tendencies were opposed by LARDNER, Stackhouse, Paley, etc., in England, and DÖRNER (Nürnberg, 1778, 2 vols.), SEMLER (Beantwortung d. Fragmente u. Ungenannten, Halle, 1780), REINHARD (Wittenberg, 1781, 5th ed., 1830), Herder (Vom Erlöser, etc., and Von Gottes Son, etc., 5 vols., Riga, 1796 sqq.), Jacob Hesse: Leben Jesu, Leipzig, 1798; 7th ed., Zürich, 1823, 3 vols.).

4. Recent times.—The studies of the life of Christ the last fifty years, both on the part of the negative (denying Christ's divinity) and the positive and believing schools, have been conducted upon critical principles, and with freedom from doctrinal prepossessions. This period may be denominated the critical and scientific period. SCHLEIERMACHER'S Lectures, delivered in Berlin for the first time in 1819 (published 1861), and K. HASE's Lectures, delivered for the first time at Tübingen, 1838 (published 1829; 5th ed., 1855; and, under the title of Gesch. u. seiner Zeit (vol. v. of his History of Israel), 2d ed., 1857 [English translation, Camb., 1865]; RIGGENBACH: Vorlesungen über d. Leben Jesu, Basel, 1858. Against Renan, Schenkel, Keim, etc., have appeared LUTHARDT: D. modernen Darstellungen d. Lebens Jesu, Leipzig, 1884; WEIZÄCKER: Untersuchungen über d. evang. Geschichte, etc., Gottha, 1884; Pressensé: Jesus Christ, son temps, sa vie, son œuvre, Paris, 1865 [English translation, Lond., 1866; 7th ed., 1879]; WIESELER: Beiträge zur richtigen Würdigung der Evangelien, Gottha, 1889. See also ELLOTTIC: Historical Lectures on the Life of our Lord Jesus Christ, Lond., 1860 (5th ed., 1881); S. J. ANDERSCHE: Leben und Wirken unser Lord N. Y., 1882 [4th ed., 1879]; F. W. FARRAR: Life of Christ, Lond., 1875, 2 vols. (28th ed., 1882); LIVES OF CHRIST have been recently written by J. GRIMM (Roman Catholic). Regensb., 1876 sqq.; C. GEIKE, Lond., 1877, 2 vols. (30th ed., 1885); B. WEISS, Berlin, 1882, 2 vols. (3rd ed., 1884); English translation, Edinburgh, 1883-84, 3 vols.; A. EEDERSHEIM, London, 1883, 2 vols., 3d ed., 1886; W. Beysschlag, Halle, 1885 sqq. Popular Lives, rather than scientific, by JEREMY TAYLOR.
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Jesus Christ, Three Offices of. A threefold office of prophet, high priest, and king, was ascribed to Jesus long ago by Eusebius (H. E., i. 8); Calvin, in his Institution (ii. 15), introduced it as a doctrine into systematic theology. It passed over into the Heidelberg Catechism (31); and from that time the theologians of the Reformed churches treated the work of Christ under this threefold aspect. The principle was first endorsed in the Lutheran Church by John Gerhard. This division of Christ's redeeming work was a natural one; and nothing is more certain than that the Old Testament depicts him as the perfect prophet, and then as the servant of Jehovah, to whom the functions of prophet, priest, and king, belong, and finally as the royal seed of David, and the priest-king. All three of these offices branch out from the idea of the Messiah, or the Anointed; for Christ was anointed prophet to preach to the poor (Isa. lxi. 1), King of righteousness (Heb. i. 8, 9), and High Priest "after the power of an endless life" (Heb. vii. 10).

The prophets spoke of the Redeemer as the future and perfect Prophet. This was first done in Deut. xviii. 15. Moses in the wilderness was sent up to Mount Sinai to hear (Deut. v. 27), and there it was revealed that God would send down a Prophet to whom the people would listen. Here is the dawning of the contrast between the law and the gospel. The prophecies of Isaiah lxxxvi. do not in the first instance concern a prophet, but the "servant of Jehovah." Isaiah works (xlii. 4) in vain; but a future Servant of Jehovah will carry out the destiny of Israel by being a prophet, and more than a prophet,—by bearing the punishment of our sins (liii.). He is also represented in this section as the King of kings, before whom the kings of the earth bow. A radical principle of the Messianic prophecies is the royal dominion of Christ. He was promised as the seed of David, whose throne should last forever (2 Sam. xii. 23 sqq.; Ps. ii. 6, 7, 4 sqq.); not only was he to be a King, but a priest-king, after the order of Melchizedek (Ps. ex. 4; Zech. vi. 12, 13). Thus the faithful Israelite was taught to expect a Messiah who should unite the priestly and prophetic offices, and at the same time establish a throne of peace. The carnal Israelite, however, looked for a "Mesiah" who should found a worldly kingdom, and not exercise prophetic or priestly functions.

Jesus attested his threefold office by his activity, suffering, and final end. When he announced the near approach of the kingdom of God, and confirmed his word by signs (euodia), he was acting as the prophet, and was so acknowledged by his disciples (Luke xxvii. 10) and others (Luke viii. 16, ix. 8; John iv. 19, etc.). Not only his activity, however, but his very person, was prophetic. It was the revelation of the Father (John xiv. 9), and he made known the fulness of his nature and will (Heb. i. 1 sqq.). For this reason he is designated the Word (John i. 1 sqq.), which was in the beginning, and became flesh (John i. 14). He was the living eternal law of God, because he was a man as God would have man (Matt. iii. 17; John iv. 34, v. 18, etc.). He was at the same time the gospel as embodied in the person of the Father (Luke iv. 17 sqq.; John i. 39, etc.). Jesus is depicted as a priest, or rather as the high priest, by the Epistle to the Hebrews (vii. sqq.). He offered himself up as a sacrifice. It is the clear teaching of Scripture that Christ, on the one hand, fulfilled all the laws of God to man, and that his
life was a holy and spotless sacrifice, and, on the other, that he submitted himself to death, which was the punishment of sin. He, therefore, was the substitute for our guilt and punishment; for the fundamental idea of the atoning sacrifices of the Old Testament was that of vicarious substitution. Christ's death had not a whit of the nature of a suicide. It was his priestly and holy life which caused his death. His sacrifice was a priestly one, just because he remained faithful where fidelity led him into the jaws of death.

But from Christ's death the crown of thorns is inseparable, and from the crown of thorns his royal dignity. He did not refuse, in the day of his humiliation, the title of "Son of David" (Matt. xxvii. 29, xxi. 9 etc.); for he was really so, and he declared himself to be such (John iv. 26; Matt. xxii. 42 sqq.). He did not exercise his royalty as the masses wanted him to do, but he manifested it in his acts. As a reward for the royalty of his priestly self-abnegation, he was crowned with the crown of glory (Phil. ii. 9, 10; Heb. ii. 9), and has a right, as king, to his people (John x. 17). As a result of this he is given to him (John xvii. 6), and shall partake of his glory (John xvii. 22, 24, 26).

From the above considerations it will be seen that the threefold division of Christ's work is essential to the scriptural representations of him. But, apart from the fall and redemption, this threefold office develops out of the very idea of a mediator. If man had not sinned, there would have been a development. In this case, would there not have been an incarnation? To deny this would mean nothing more nor less than that the fall was an absolutely indispensable stage in the development towards perfection, which could not have happened without sin. If the proposition be true, — no apostasy, no Christ, — then sin is an advantage, a conclusion which would be the grave of all the first principles of Christian ethics. God would have revealed himself to the race, even if there had been no apostasy. He would have then revealed himself through a prophet to lead men to higher stages of knowledge, through a priest who would offer himself up a living offering to the good of every individual, and through a king as the leader of men.

Christ combined these three offices, and, as the Word, led sinful man out of his error, darkness, and falsehood, and revealed to him the law and the grace of God. As the holy, priestly offering, he removed the curse of sin from the world by himself bearing it in our stead. As the king, he reigns in heaven. The exercise of these three offices were not confined to any special periods in Christ's public life on earth, nor is it limited to any special period in his glory; he continues at all times to be the exponent of the Father to the world, the world's intercessor with the Father, and the head of his Church.

EBBARD, JESUS, Society of the Sacred Heart of. The devotion to the sacred heart of Jesus was the work of the Jesuit La Combre, who reared the institution on the visions of Maria Alacoque, a nun in the monastery of Paray le Monial in Burgundy (d. in 1690, canonized in 1684). Afterwards the Jesuits were zealous for the formation of the heart of Jesus, and made the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, whose number in 1726 increased to three hundred and ten in France, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy, and Poland; and it was on the basis of these brotherhoods, that, towards the close of the eighteenth century, a number of societies was organizing in which the Jesuits hoped to continue the existence of their order. Thus the ex-Jesuits, De Tournely, de Broglie, and others, formed in 1784, at Louvain, the Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. By the advancing French armies the society was compelled to fly, first to Augsburg, then to Passau, and finally to Vienna. In 1789 they had a college at Hagenbrunn, a novitiate-house at Prague, etc.; but in the following year they united with the Baccanarists, according to the wish of the Pope.

Of much more importance is the female society of the same name, the Ladies of the Sacred Heart (Dames du Sacré Cœur). It was organized at Paris in 1800, and in 1806 it numbered about ten thousand members. Its organization and rules are those of the order of the Jesuits, only with such modifications as the difference of the sex of the members makes necessary. Its object is female education. The association has been expelled from all countries from which the Jesuits have been excluded.

G. E. STEITZ.

JETER, Jeremiah B., D.D., b. in Bedford County, Va., July 18, 1802; d. in Richmond, Feb. 23, 1860. He entered the Baptist ministry in 1822, and occupied a very prominent position. He was, perhaps, more widely known in the United States than any other Baptist minister; but the greater part of his ministry was spent in Richmond.

JETHRO. See Moses.

JEW, The Wandering. The legend of the Wandering Jew appeared for the first time in German literature in a small pamphlet, Kurze Beschreibung und Erzählung von einem Juden mit Namen Ahasuerus, 1602. Before that time no trace can be found of it in Germany; and it is quite evident, that, for instance, neither Luther nor Hans Sachs knew anything about it. The pamphlet pretends to be a report of an interview between Paulus von Eitzen, bishop of Sleswick, and the Wandering Jew, which took place in Hamburg, 1542. According to Von Eitzen's report, Ahasuerus is the name of the Wandering Jew; and he was a shoemaker in Jerusalem at the time of Christ. When Jesus, on his way to Golgotha, passed by his house, he stopped for a moment, and leaned against the door-post; and when Ahasuerus pushed him aside, and bade him to move on, Jesus said to him, "I will stand here and rest, but thou shalt go on until the last day." From that moment Ahasuerus found rest nowhere. Wandering about from place to place, he has been seen in Spain, Germany, and other places, as later editions of the Kurze Beschreibung report.

In the English and French literatures the legend appeared about four centuries earlier, though in a somewhat different shape. Matthew Paris, an English monk who lived in the monastery of St. Alban in Paris, and died 1258, tells a story about a certain Cartaphilus, which he claims to have heard from an Armenian bishop who visited London. According to this story, Cartaphilus was a door-keeper in the palace of Pilate; and, when Jesus was led out to be crucified, he
struck him, and said to him, "Go, Jesus: go on faster." To which Jesus replied, "I go, but thou shalt wait till I return." Afterwards Car- thaliphus was baptized by Ananias, assumed the name of Joseph, and settled in Armenia, where he was still living when Matthew Paris wrote his Historia Major. The same story is repeated in the Chronicles of the Picts, by Philippe, who was Bishop of Tournay, and died in 1238.

Against the identity of these two representa- tions, it has been argued that Carthaliphus was not a Jew, but a Christian, and probably, before baptism, a Pagan; that he was not perpetually wander- ing, but comfortably fixed in Armenia, etc. [But transitions as comprehensive and vital as this, from the door-keeper of the thirteenth, to the shoemaker of the sixteenth century, are often met with in legends and popular tales, in their wandering through several centuries and from one people to another; and the explanations which Karl Blind has given of several features of the transition (Gentleman's Magazine, July, 1880) are at least suggestive. He derives the name Ahasuerus from the Teutonic As-Vidar, the only god who should survive the destruction of the world, and who should avenge the fall of the Asars by thrusting his foot, well beshod, down into the throat of the wolf Fenris.]


JEWEL, John, Bishop of Salisbury; the fore- most apologistical writer of the English Church, and its literary representative in the first years of Elizabeth's reign; was b. in Buden, Devonshire, May 22 [24], 1522; d. at Monkton Farleigh, in his diocese, Sept. 23, 1571. He entered Merton College, Oxford, at the age of thirteen, and was placed under the tuition of Parkhurst, afterwards bishop of Norwich, from whom he received the principles of the Reformation [and who directed him to compare Tyndale's translation with that of Coverdale]. He was an excellent Greek scholar, and in 1540 graduated from Corpus Christi College. [He was in the habit, as a student, of rising at four in the morning, but suffered, during his university career, from a rheumatic affection, which left him late for life.] He acted as Reader in Humanity and Rhetoric [and after 1551 cared for the cure of Sunningwell, near Oxford]. In 1549 he heard Peter Martyr, and became an ad- vocate of the Reformation. When Mary ascended the throne in 1553, he was expelled from his college as a diligent hearer of Peter Martyr, as having taken orders according to the liturgy of Edward, and preaching heretical doctrines. In spite of this, however, he was chosen university orator, and in this capacity had to pen a letter congratulating Mary on her accession. In a mo- ment of weakness he gave his consent to Romish articles, but, repenting, fled to the Continent in 1554. 

Jewel's Apology is the most perfect expression of the peculiar position of the English Church. It is divided into six parts, and refutes the charges of heresy, godlessness, libertinism, apostasy from the Church, etc. In the doctrinal treatment he shows the influence of Calvin and Peter Martyr; and in the articles on the Person of Christ, the Power of the Keys, and the Sacraments, he is in perfect agreement with them. On the other hand, the doctrine of predestination is wanting; and in regard to justification, he says that our salvation depends entirely upon Christ, and not upon works. He makes no distinction between the visible and invisible Church. He teaches that there are three orders, but defines their functions in a Calvinistic sense, and grants to laity the exercise of ministerial duties in cases of necessity. The statement is repeated again and again, that the English Reformation was only a return to the
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old true Catholic Church of the first centuries; and the charge of innovation he repels by affirming it of the Roman-Catholic Church, which had forsaken Christ and the Apostles and Fathers. The Scriptures are the ultimate rule of faith; and the Fathers are not our spiritual “lords, but our leaders” (non sunt domini, sed duces nostris).

Among Jewel’s other works, were A View of the excesses of the Church of Rome, 1563; an Exposition upon the Two Epistles to the Thessalonians [1583], and many Letters to Peter Martyr. [Jewel had, perhaps, no superior in the realm of patristic scholarship among the English clergy of the Elizabethan period. His works are a treasure of quotation, “his margin being painted in" of the Roman-Catholic Church, which had experienced kindness from him, says that he was "the worthiest divine that Christendom had bred for some hundreds of years.”]

The first edition of Bishop Jewel’s works appeared in 1609, recent editions, in the Parker Society Library, Camb., 1845–50, 4 vols., and [by Dr. Jelf, Oxford, 1848, 8 vols.]; Lives by Humphrey (1753), Charles Webb Le Bas, 1835 [and in the above editions].

JEWISH CHRISTIANS, JUDEAIZERS. The primitive form of Christianity was Jewish Christianity. The Christians at first appeared to be simply a part of Israel. Like Israel, they had their centre in Jerusalem; and the church there, at the head of which was the College of the Apostles, was not only the chief, but in a sense the only one, of which the other gatherings of Christians were branches. The introduction of the diaconate, to which followed the presbyterate, caused the first loosening from Judaism. Yet the Law held the Christian and his Jewish brother alike; while the confession that the crucified and risen Jesus was the Son of God was the dividing mark. Both, however, took part in the temple-worship; and even the separate services of the Christians, as they did not involve any change of life, seemed to be merely additional. But when a Gentile Christian Church sprang up, and the hatred of the unconverted Israelites increased, the question of the real relation of Judaism to Christianity claimed discussion. This caused a split among the Jewish Christians. Some of them maintained that the whole Law was binding upon the converted heathens; others, and they were the majority in the Council of Jerusalem (see Apostolic Council), that it was binding only upon the Jewish Christians. The minority organized a counter-mission to that of Paul, opposed him vigorously, decried him, and strove to bring the Gentile Christians to their views. These were the Judeaizers, who gave Paul so much trouble. They claimed the coenestas of James, and with some show of reason.

Doubtless there were churches of the liberal Jewish believers in Palestine and the adjacent parts. At their head were, first, the “pillar apostles,”—James, Peter, and John; later, James the Lord’s brother, who wielded almost episcopal authority. This mild Jewish-Christian point is represented in the Epistles of James, Jude, and 1 Peter, and the Revelation, to which also may be reckoned the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. Characteristic of them is the absence of dogmatism, and the stress laid upon practice. Facts are held, but principles are not evolved. Another characteristic is their immediate grasp upon the person of Christ, without entering at all upon the reason for his appearance, or upon the grounds of his being and work. Christology is in the background; on the other hand, eschatology is in the front. They emphasize the kingship of Christ in fulfilment of Old-Testament prophecy, and look for his second coming in glory. In these books, however, we may see progress. James most exactly represents the Jewish-Christian standpoint; Jude forms the transition to Peter; Peter to Paul; and the Revelation is the connecting link between the Jewish-Christian and the Johannine types of doctrine.

The whole position of Jewish Christianity at this time was provisional. The council had not settled its relation to Christianity in general. It was plain that it must either enter the stream, and lose its individuality, or else narrow into a mere sect; for, even in Paul’s lifetime, the supposition that the Gentile Christians would gradually accept the Mosaic law became untenable. Two causes hastened the decisive change,—the increasing speed of conversions among the Gentiles, and the increasing hardness of the Israelites against the gospel. But exactly when the Jewish Christians were forbidden the temple is not determinable: they would scarcely be tolerated in it down to the destruction of the city. It must have been a trying time for the converts, and many, doubtless, chose to give up the Messiah rather than their people and the old religion.

The Epistle to the Hebrews, written at this period, gives us a hint of this perplexity. The final separation between Jewish Christianity and Israel may be set down as taking place when Hadrian ordered all Jews to leave Jerusalem; for, after the destruction of the city by Titus (A.D. 70), many had returned, and a Jewish-Christian episcopacy had been established. For the after-history of these believers see Ebionites. See also Jerusalem and the cognate articles.

JEWIS. See ISRAEL.

JEWIS, Missions amongst. Although the kingdom of God was designed, according to the predictions of the prophets, to be co-extensive with the whole earth, nevertheless, Jesus confined his activity to Israel, and enjoined on his disciples not to go in the way of the Gentiles (Matt. x. 5). It was not till he was about to depart from the earth that he commanded them to go into all the world (Matt. xxviii. 19). The Twelve, however, directed their efforts, in the first instance, to the Jews; and the earliest Christian congregations were composed entirely of Jews, and proselytes to Judaism. Apostolic missions among the Jews were so successful, that Paul could speak [about 58 A.D.] of myriads of converted Jews (Acts xxii. 20); and we are safe in computing their number at twenty-five thousand at least. A large number of priests were also obedient to the faith (Acts vii. 7); and in the congregations which Paul founded in Asia Minor and Greece the nucleus was Israelite. Wherever he went, whether to Cyprus, Macedonia, or Corinth, he proclaimed the gospel first in the synagogues.

The conversion of the Jews was not lost sight of in the second or third century, as is proved by
the dialogue of Justin Martyr with the Jew Trypho, and Tertullian's work Adversus Judaeos. But Jewish Christianity had long since followed a heretical tendency by insisting upon Jewish peculiarities of religion and nationality, and by submitting to the rankest Gnosticism. Deprived of their political power and national autonomy, the Jews concentrated their whole spiritual life upon the study of the law and professed the Talmud. As long as the temple stood, Judaism still preserved much of its Mosaic cast, although leavened by Pharisaism. But the transition from Mosaic to Talmudism opened a chasm between Jews and Christians, which made an impartial examination of Christianity on the part of the Jews impossible. From the very beginning, the spirit of the Talmud drew a veil over their eyes (2 Cor. iii. 13-16), and will continue to hold it there until it itself disappears. The whole history of Jewish missions confirms this. They are successful only when they can make a breach in the Talmudic exposition of the same, as to lead them to Christianity. His were political motives. Bishops did not hesitate to resort to acts of violence to compel the Jews to become Christians. Bishop Avitus of Clermont Ferrand having preached to the Jews without any results, the Christians destroyed the synagogue. M. Joshua of Brundisium (d. 1619), general of the Catholic League, wrote several Hebrew and Spanish works for the conversion of the Jews. Antonio Cardinal de Luna, known later as Benedict XIII., himself had a debate in Pamplona with Rabbi Schen Tob ben Schaprut, and took a lifelong interest in the conversion of the Jews. He was the first patron of Rabbi Solomon Halevi (1353-1435), later known as Paul of St. Maria, archbishop of Burgos, and interchanged letters with Joshua of Loreto, until he finally became a Christian. Amongst the thousands who at that time, from fear and force, entered the Church, there were a large number of earnest disciples of Jesus. Even Grätz must confess that "Judaism was deprived of much talent in the transition of learned and cultured men—physicians, authors, poets—to Christianity; many of whom, however, were possessed of proselyting zeal, as though they were "born Dominicans" (viii. 83). Astruc Raimuch and John Baptist, both physicians and proselytes, demonstrated their missionary zeal by words and pen. Leading to the most results was the great dispute at Tortosa (February, 1413, to Nov. 12, 1414), which held sixty-eight sittings, and was carried on by eight of the most learned rabbis of Spain, with two proselytes, under the chairmanship of Benedict XIII. Contemporaneously the Dominican Vincentius Ferrer developed his extensive missionary activity amongst the Jews, preaching repentance in Italy, France, and Germany; so that at least twenty thousand five hundred Jews in Castile and Aragon (the exaggerated Jewish accounts even speak of two hundred thousand) were baptized. The case was quite different in France. With the exception of Nicholas of Lyra (1300-40), born a Christian, but by descent a Jew, there was little interest amongst the Jews in the conversion to Christianity. Tho the proselytes, thoroughly convinced, did not pass over to Christianity, many of whom became ornaments in the Church.

It has been especially proselytes who in all ages, inspired by missionary zeal, have sought to influence their brethren. Thus the proselyte and bishop Julian of Toledo (d. 690) wrote a work (De sexta etatis comprobatione contra Judaeos) in order to refute the Jewish notion, then asserting itself, that Jesus could not be the Messiah, as he was not to appear until the year 6000 of the world's history. About the same time Isidore of Seville wrote two books proving Christianity from the Old Testament. The activity of the great Dominican friars, had long since followed the example of the preceding. Of these friars, the name of the Spanish friar, Saint Vincent Ferrer, is most prominent. He was born in 1350 Paul of Spain, was a great preacher and missionary, and by his works, for the conversion of the Jews. The Council of Constance concerned
offices in the Church.

but the fidelity of the proselytes withstood him.

The king wanted to force them to return to Judaism,

many of the brethren became Christians.

William Rufus, the Jews complained because so

in Italy, have accepted the faith, and held high

0 Lincoln, Robert Grosseteste (d. 1253), wrote a

med asimilar institution.

The great Bishop

About 1200 Richard, prior of Bermondsey, built

a house for the reception and care of

proselytes. Under Edward I. five hundred pros-

lytes, according to a list still existing, received

baptism in it. Notwithstanding this, sixteen

thousand five hundred Jews were banished from

the land by this edict in 1290.

More recently Roman-Catholic missions among

the Jews have been represented by the two broth-

ers Ratisbonne and the two brothers Lehmann.

The most extensive work, however, is carried on

in Palestine by the proselyte Maria Alphonso

Ratisbonne, a man of a rich French family, who

in 1842 accepted Christianity. With his brother

he established a house for the Jews to become like

us Pagans, we should treat them with

condemn their peculiarities, and treat them with

haughty contempt. As they conducted them

with such haughtiness, the Jews were

forced to renounce the Talmud, the immediate re-

sults of which, in Germany, were, that large num-

bers turned to Christianity. In thirty years the

half of the Berlin community passed over to the

Church (Grätz, xi. 171). Between the years 1816

and 1843, 3,084 Jews, and these the richest and

most cultured, were baptized in eight Prussian

provinces. About the same time a new zeal for

the conversion of the Jews manifested itself in

Christian lands,—a consequence, in part, of the

expectation of the near end of the world. It was

Lewis Way, a rich clergyman of England, who

in 1814 the Duke of Kent laid the corner-

stone of a church for the Jews, with which was

afterwards associated a school for the children of

proselytes, a college for the training of mission-

aries, etc.

In 1815 it came exclusively under the patron-

age of the Church of England. Way travelled

through Holland, Germany, and Russia, to

improve the social, political, and religious condi-

tions of the Jews; and he was successful in in-

fluencing the czar, Alexander I., to promise, in 1817,

his special protection, as well as lands, to baptized

Jews. In 1814 the Duke of Kent laid the corner-

stone of a church for the Jews, with which was

afterwards associated a school for the children of

proselytes, a college for the training of mission-

aries, etc., which gave this block the name of Pales-

tine Block. In London and other places there

were many baptisms; so that some proselytes were

in 1832 seriously thinking of a Hebrew Christian

Church, which, fortunately, was not founded. In

1880 this society had twenty-eight stations in

twenty-two years, 9,350 Jews have been baptized,

and 78 in 1878. Its principal organ is

Dibre Emeth, or "Words of Truth," edited by

Hartmann, and more recently by Le Roi.
Among the other missionary societies for the conversion of the Jews are the following:—

(1) The Mission of the Church of Scotland, established in 1840, with twenty-six laborers, amongst whom are seven proselytes, laboring at six stations in Turkey and Egypt. (2) The British Society, established in 1842, and made up principally of dissenters. All its laborers are proselytes. There are twenty-seven in number, working at nineteen stations in England, Hungary, Russia, Turkey, etc. Its organ is the *Jewish Herald*. In 1879 fifteen Jews were baptized. (3) The Mission of the Free Church of Scotland, established in 1843, laboring at five stations, and employing twenty-seven workers. (4) The Presbyterian Church of Ireland (twelve workers), the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland (in Spain and in Algiers), and the Presbyterians in England (two stations in London), carry on missions. (5) The London City Missionary Society employs three missionaries for the Jews. (6) The German societies are four. The Berlin Society, established in 1849, has one mission station, and has done much for its work by his masterly translation of the New Testament into Hebrew. The Westphalian Society, established in 1844, employs four laborers. The Lutheran Society, established at Leipzig, 1849, has one missionary. Professor Delitzsch is the soul of this society, and its organ is the *Jewish Herald*. (7) There are also societies in Basel (1831), Norway (1840), Amsterdam (1851), Stockholm (1874), etc. (8) In the United States there is only one society for the prosecution of missions among the Jews. It is connected with the Episcopal Church, with Rev. C. Ellis Stevens (32 Bible House) as its secretary, was organized in 1878, and has an income of seven thousand dollars. There are, however, some independent workers among the Jews, as Rev. Jacob Freshman, himself a convert, who holds weekly services in New York (1882). These societies, which number in all more than twenty, employ about 270 workers, of whom about one-half are of Jewish extraction. The average yearly number of baptisms is 626, of which 565 occur in the Protestant Church, and 61 in the Greek. A hundred thousand is a fair estimate of the number of Jews who have accepted Christianity since the beginning of the century.


JEZEBEL (*джебель*, "chaste"), a daughter of Ethbaal, king of the Zidonians (1 Kings xvi. 31), was the wife of Ahab, king of Israel, and one of the most unscrupulous, and at the same time energetic, queens of history. She seems to have swayed the mind of her husband; and where he was weak and vacillating, like Lady Macbeth, she supplied courage and resolution. She established the Phoenician worship in the kingdom, and supported eight hundred and fifty of the priests of Baal a good wage at the royal table. With unfailing energy she persecuted the prophets of Israel (1 Kings xviii. 4), and vowed vengeance upon Elijah (1 Kings xix. 2). When her husband despaired of getting Naboth's vineyard, she was not at a loss for measures, and plottted and perjured, working at Naboth's murder (1 Kings xxi. 5). She survived Ahab fourteen years, but continued to have great influence at court, under her son, and saw her daughter Athaliah married to the king of Judah (2 Kings viii. 26). But the day of retribution predicted by Elijah came at last. When Jehu drove into Jezebel, with the design of extirpating the house of Ahab, Jezebel stood, attired in the fashion of the day, at the window of the palace. At a word from Jehu, she was thrown out by several chamberlains, and was dashed to death on the stones beneath. Her body was subjected to being crushed by Jehu's chariot-wheels, and devoured by the dogs (2 Kings ix. 30-36).

JEZÆRÉEL, The City of, stood in the plain of the same name, between Gilboa and Little Hermon. It was of very little importance until Ahab chose it for his residence. His palace was on the eastern side of the city, forming part of the wall, the gateway of the city being also that of the palace (2 Kings ix. 30); and near by was a temple, and grove of Astarte, with four hundred priests, the whole establishment supported by Jezebel (1 Kings xviii. 19). After the fall of the house of Ahab, the city again sank into insignificance. Now it is represented by a small village, Zerin.

JIMENES, Cardinal. See XIMENES.

JOAB (351, "whose father is Jehovah"), one of the three sons of Zeruiah, David's sister (2 Sam. ii. 18), and one of David's most valiant captains; contributed very materially to establish the Davidic dynasty. He was a bold and intrepid soldier, but never rose above the level of the wild chieftains of his day, as David did. He won a brilliant victory at Gibea, over Abner, Ishobaeth's lieutenant (2 Sam. ii. 18-24). At a later period, when Absalom, at the head of a great army, assembled at the foot of his parent's palace, David, Joab, in order to avenge his brother Assahel, and perhaps from motives of jealousy, murdered him in cold blood (2 Sam. iii. 27). David was incensed at the deed, but did not feel strong enough to punish his captain. In a campaign against Edom he put the inhabitants to death without mercy (1 Kings xi. 15-17). He fought against the Syrians (2 Sam. x. 6-14), and in the following year besieged Rabbah, the chief city of the Ammonites (2 Sam. xi. 1). About this time Joab became an accessory to the murder of Uriah, whom David's improper relations to his wife induced him to put out of the way. Obedient to his king, he stationed Uriah in the most exposed part of the army, where he was shot down by the enemy (2 Sam. xi.). When Absalom was caught in the oak, Joab murdered him in spite of the king's order that he should be spared (2 Sam. xviii. 14). The last deed of War was his treacherous murder of Amasa, Absalom's captain (2 Sam. xx. 10). He remained faithful to David till the last years of his reign, when he espoused the cause of Adonijah. Solomon, how-
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ever, ascended the throne. He at first spared Joab, but subsequently was led to change his mind, and, when he fled to the altar of the sanctuary, had him murdered (1 Kings ii. 28-34).

JOACHIM OF FLORIS. Very little is known with certainty of the life of this remarkable man. The biography which Jacobus Grecus Syllanæus, a monk of the monastery of Flore, published in 1612, is very little reliable, in spite of the author's appeal to elder documents; and the notes of his friend and secretary Jacobus have not come down to us in their original form. He is said to have been born at Celicum, a village near Cosenza, in 1145, and to have been brought to the court of Roger II. of Sicily when he was fourteen years old (Roger II., however, died in 1154). After a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, he became monk, and afterwards abbot, of the Cistercian monastery of Corace in Calabria. (See Janauscheck: Origin. Cisterci., Vienna, 1877, i. p. 168.) But he afterwards left that place, and retired, with his friend Rainerus, to the mountain solitudes of Sylae, near Cosenza. There he built a new monastery (St. Joachim), but subsequently was led to change his mind, and, when he fled to the altar of the cathedral, he was received with such favor by Cælestine III., and became the mother of several other similar establishments. Three popes—Lucius III., Urban III., and Clement III.—took an interest in his prophetico-apocalyptical studies; and in a document drawn up in 1200, containing the names of his works,—Concordiut utriusque testamenti; Expositiones in Apoc., Psalmierium; Contrá Judæos; Contrá Cathol. Fid. Adversarios, of which the two last have perished,—he admonished his brother-abbots to lay by his works before the Pope, and obtain his sanction. He died between September, 1201, and June, 1202.

The first point in which Joachim drew down upon himself the censure of the Church, though not until after his death, was his polemics against the scholastic exposition of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity by Petrus Lombardus. The Lombard's definition of the divine essence seemed to him to lead to a quaternity; but, in his attempt to escape from this error, he himself fell into a kind of trinitarianism, which was severely censured by the Fourth Council of the Lateran, 1215 (Mansi: Concil., xxii. 981). Of still graver import were those speculations which developed from his scholastic views, and which finally assumed a decidedly anti-Roman and anti-churchly tendency. Joachim taught that there had been a reign of the Father from the creation to the birth of Christ, and a reign of the Son, which should come to an end in 1290, and be followed by a reign of the Holy Spirit. These views were adopted by certain groups of the Franciscan order, and gave rise to the idea of an everlasting gospel, which should supersede both the Old and the New Testament. The Introductiorium in Evangelium Eternum, written by Ghehardinus de Burgo Saneti Domini, and published in Paris, 1254, made an immense sensation, and caused a still further development of the apocalyptic ideas of Joachim. See Gérard: Histoire de l'Abbat. Joachim, Paris, 1745, 2 vols; Renan: Joachim de Flore et l'Evangile éternel, in the Revue des Deux Mondes, 1866; and Preger: Evangelium Eternum und Joachim von Floris, in Abhandlungen der kgl. bayer. Akademie, Munich, 1874.

JOAN, Pope, a fable in which hardly anybody now believes, and whose whole interest consists in its origin. It is first mentioned by Stephen of Bourbon, a French Dominican, who died in 1261; but it did not spread among people until it became inserted (for in the oldest manuscripts it is not found) in the Chronicle of Martinus Polonus, a much used text-book. According to this interpolation, she resigned for more than two years, and died in 855, from bearing a child while walking in a procession through the streets. See Dößinger: Die Pachtsfabeln des Mittelalters, Munich, 1863; English translation, Fables respecting the Popes in the Middle Ages, New York, 1872, pp. 3-74.

JOAN OF ARC, "the Maid of Orleans" [whose name was properly Joanneta Darc, or d'Arc; but probably "d" did not at that time imply nobility]; a. at Domremy, which was then partly in Champagne, and partly in Lorraine (now part of Germany, and called, in honor of its illustrious daughter, Domremy-la-Pucelle), France was burnt at the stake, in Rouen, May 30, 1431. Her life may be divided into three periods: (1) her development, and call to her departure for Vaucouleurs in her eighteenth year; (2) her career of fighting and defeat, until her death. In all these periods she is one of the greatest heroines in history; in the second a recognized seer, unmistakably called of God; in the third an enthusiast, but genuinely pious and noble, whose exit constitutes a tragedy most thrilling and elevated.

In order to understand her work, a word must be spoken upon the then state of the country now called France. By the help of Philip of Burgundy, the English had overrun all the country north of the Loire, as well as Guienne. France had fallen to pieces. The queen-mother Isabella had the Duke of Burgundy upon her side, and the two had taken Paris. She had disinherited the dauphin (Charles VII.) in favor of Henry V. of England; and when he was succeeded by his son (1422), his brother, the Duke of Bedford, came over to France as English regent, was received by the French, and besieged Orléans (1428). Meanwhile Charles VII., who had been crowned at Poitiers, was idly looking at the destruction of his kingdom; but, unknown to him, God was preparing a deliverer.

1. In the little village on the Maas, amid beautiful scenery and under favorable parental auspices, a girl was growing up. She learned from her mother the traditional creed, and forms of prayer. She drank in the tales of fairies and saints and devils which the simple folk so often told. One saying, attributed to Merlin, made one day be destroyed by a woman, and be saved by a virgin from the borders of Lorraine. The people about her had decided that the destroyer was the queen-mother Isabella, and at last she believed herself to be the restorer. She grew up to womanhood skilful in woman's work, especially in needlework, shy, shunning, indeed, all amorous looks and words, ignorant of reading and writing, but wise in divine things, loving the
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Church and its services, tender toward the poor and toward children,—a maiden pious, brave, obedient. It should be remarked that her village was for the dauphin, while the neighboring village was for Burgundy. One day, in her thirteenth year, she was fasting in her father's garden (it was about noon), when suddenly she heard a voice which she learned was that of St. Michael. She then saw him and the angels who attended him. At a subsequent time she heard the voice of the archangel Gabriel and the saints Catherine and Margaret. These all urged upon her one duty,—to help the king to save France. She shrank in terror from their command. For five years she was visited almost daily, and often more than once a day. At last the news came of the siege of Orleans. She could no longer refuse obedience. Impelled by an overmastering sense of duty, she broke through the lines of paternal authority, left Domremy, and repaired to Vaucouleurs. Thus ended the first period of her existence.

2. Then followed the epic of her life. By persistence she secured from Robert de Baudicourt, the governor of Vaucouleurs, an introduction to the dauphin, at Chinon. The journey thither was perilous; and, for safety's sake, Joan wore male attire. But the hardest part of her work remained for her to do. She grandly succeeded, however, overcame the doubts of the king, removed all prejudices, filled the troops with her courage, and started the king and his army towards Orleans. She rode by the king, clad in armor, carrying an ancient sword, which she had found by revelation hidden near the altar in the Church of St. Catherine de Fierbois, and a banner of her own design, under the guidance of St. Catherine, on one side of which was a representation of God seated upon his throne, and holding the world in his hand; on the other side a picture of the annunciation. Arrived at Orleans, she was able to enter it April 29, 1429; and the siege was raised May 8. Victories followed. "The English were driven before the savior of her country; and king and council, in terror from their command, left Rouen." After that the people were content.

3. Thus, amid shouts of victory, the final period of her life was ushered in. But she was altered. Her head was turned. She had become an enthusiast. The court and the army had also changed respecting her. They obeyed no longer her guiding voice. They defied her. She was not now a leader, but a god,—sure sign that her mission was over. She went with enthusiasm on martial expeditions; but she was no longer personally invulnerable, nor a synonyme of victory. On the contrary, she fell, wounded in the thigh, while unpitifully attacking Paris, Sept. 8; later she was wounded again before Orleans, and the army sustained another defeat. On Dec. 29, 1429, she and her family were ennobled with the surname of Du Lis. About this time she wrote a threatening letter to the Hussites to repent of their heresy, or else she would draw sword against them. She also announced her ambitious dreams of releasing the Duke of Orleans, freeing the Holy Land from its usurpers, ending the papal schism, and giving the Papacy to its rightful claimant. But, while such visions floated before her eyes, her "voices" told her that she would be taken prisoner. In her distracted frame of mind she mistrusted the voices. She went in March, 1430, to defend Compiègne against the forces of Burgundy. On May 24 she was captured on a sortie. Great was the triumph of the English, and Paris broke out in rejoicing. The sorceress had been caught. Joan was taken to the fortress of Jean de Luxembourg. Contrary to the warning of St. Catherine she left it. Stunned, severely wounded, she was picked up and carried back, and, on coming to, the saint upbraided her for her disobedience. Her further troubles came heavy and fast. A disreputable traffic was carried on between the Duke of Luxembourg and the English, at the instigation of the university of Paris, resulting in the sale of Joan, in November, to the latter for ten thousand livres: Normandy paid the money. On her recovery from her injuries, she was carried to Rouen, put in chains, guarded by rude soldiers, insulted in various ways, and finally accused of heresy and sorcery. Upon these charges she was tried by the Inquisition. It was a shameful travesty of justice. Verdict was given against her on the following counts: that she had worn men's clothing, contrary to the law in the Old Testament (Deut. xxii. 5); that she had allied herself with evil spirits under the enchanted trees of her native province; and that her revelations were machinations of the Devil, or sorcery (in proof whereof her departure from her home was cited). She was sentenced to be burnt as a witch. Terrified at the prospect of such a frightful death, she recanted, saying, that since the churchmen had found that she had not received visits from saints, as she had previously asserted, she would not make the assertion any more. It is said that she smiled when uttering the sentence of recantation, and signed the formula with a naught, but then, under guidance, wrote the number nine. But evidences were considered suspicious. In consequence of the recantation, her sentence was mitigated to imprisonment for life. The English were furious, but were consoled by the assurance that she would yet be burnt. A trap was cunningly laid for her destruction. A suit of men's clothing was hung in her cell. She put it on, thinking thus to be better protected from the soldiers' insults. But the action was interpreted as a relapse into her former sinful disobedience to divine command, and she was again tried and condemned. This time she could not escape. The sentence of death, after the first outcry, was patiently borne. She appealed from the bishop (Pierre Cauchon) to God; stood at the stake, the heretic's cap upon her head, pressing to her heart a rude wooden cross which a pitiful Englishman had made for her; spoke a word of sympathy for Rouen; cleared the king of all responsibility for her sentence; called upon her saints and her Saviour; and perished amid the flames. Her ashes were thrown into the Seine.

The king whom she had crowned made no effort
to free her, thinking, perhaps, he was well rid of her. But it was not long before her death, under sentence of the Inquisition, was considered a veritable martyrdom.

It was said that a white dove flew towards heaven from her scaffold in witness of her virgin innocence. When Rouen was taken in 1149, the king ordered a revision of her trial. Proceeding examined by the bishops and the inquisitor Calixtus III., on demand of France, had the prolonged examination of the Inquisition, and the sentence was reversed by the Pope, July 7, 1456. Her name is now reverently spoken everywhere.

[Fine statue of her was unveiled in the Place des Pyramides, Paris, Feb. 26, 1873.]

And what about her visions? They were real, were sent from God to incite and strengthen her for her great mission. In them and in the general tenor of her life we see the providence of God. Since God had chosen her to be the savior of France, he chose also the means of inducing her to play the part. The persons beheld are proof of this. Why did she not see the Virgin Mary, St. Dionysius, and St. Mary Magdalene, the guardian of France? And whom did she see? The archangel Michael, who was the victorious angel of the covenant, the guardian of the people of Israel, and, in the middle age, the guardian of Christian nationality; St. Margaret, the dragon conqueress, who was the guardian of Christian virginity; and St. Catherine, who was the guardian of the university of Paris, and had been successful in converting learned people and rulers generally. Now, nationality, purity, and power to convert royal persons, scholars, and soldiers, were exactly what was needed to restore France to honor. Joan resembled, somewhat, Swedenborg and other seers. But her saints punished her, and she died penance. They came back after her recantation, and then she no longer resisted them, but died in testimony of their reality.

[A curious phenomenon, which proved the reversal of feeling in favor of Joan, was the appearance, in 1436, of a false Joan, who told the story that some other woman had been burnt for her. Many believed the impostor. She married Rob- er de Artois about 1439, and died about 1444, having previously confessed her imposture.]

[Joan of Arc is thus described: "She was of medium height, stoutly built, but finely proportioned; and her frame was capable of enduring great fatigue. The most authentic testimonies represent her as least comely than many in her own station. Her features expressed rustic honesty and innocence rather than mental power; but her eyes were large, melancholy, and, lit up with her enthusiasm, indescribably charming. Her voice was powerful, but sweet; and her manner possessed a fine natural dignity and grace, which, while it was called familiar and homely, was subdued even the rudest of the soldiers."]


The Book of Job is a product of the Chochma literature of the ancient Hebrews. All the features which distinguish the Proverbs, the Song of Solomon, and Ecclesiastes, from the prophetic books, are found in it. The book contains, however, an historical tradition which the author worked over. The proper names do not contain a trace of a symbolic purpose; and pure invention of stories was not a custom of antiquity.

Luther said, "I hold the Book of Job to be a record of facts; but, that every thing happened just as it is recorded, I do not believe," etc. The author does not once refer, even indirectly, to the law, religion, or history of Israel; but he does not ignore his Hebrew standpoint. In the narrative portion, God is called Jehovah; but in the rest of the book he is, for the most part, called Eloah, or by the patriarchal designation Shaddai. It is noticeable, that only the most ancient form of heathen worship, the worship of the stars, is referred to (xxx1. 36-28), and that he intentionally avoids the divine name, Lord of Hosts, which was characteristic of the period of the kings.

The book discusses a theme which has interest for the race without regard to nationality, and is the Melechizedek among the books of the Old Testament.

Job lived in the land of Uz (probably the Hauran); but the time is not indicated. The high age (a hundred and forty years) to which the patriarch attained (xlii. 16) points to a very early period; and this explains why only one kind of music (xlii. 11; comp. Gen. xxxxi. 19), and only the three most ancient musical instruments are mentioned (xxi. 12, xxx. 31; comp. Gen. iv. 21, xxxi. 27). A hero of pre-Mosaic times suited the author's purposes best, as ignorance of the God of Israel after the possession of the land by Joshua, would have been regarded as a sad deficiency. Job was a just man, who was plunged from great prosperity into the depths of suffering. He was himself unable to solve the mystery of this sudden change. The attempt was made by his friends, who only increased his trials. They sought to console him by insisting that suffering is invariably the punishment of transgression; but he continued to assert his innocence, which Jehovah himself finally confirmed (xiii. 8). The mistake of the comforters was, that they failed to distinguish between different kinds of suffering and its cause. Job's sufferings were not punitive, but a trial which he was called upon, as the servant of Jehovah, to endure. His friends cannot think of suffering without sin, and, instead of offering words of sympathy, heap up exhortations to repentance. But there is a kind of suffering which does not proceed from God's anger, but from his love, and has the design to test and perfect the piety of a righteous man. This is the lesson the Book of Job is meant to teach.

After Job's conversation with his three friends, and the renewed protestation of his innocence,
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Jehovah himself appears on the scene to solve the problem. But, before this occurs, a certain Elihu, the youngest of the three friends, interjects four wise words (xxxii.—xxxvii.). He was a young man, who had up to this time been restrained by considerations of modesty from entering into the conversation. He now censures Job for justifying himself at the expense of God, and the three friends for having failed already to convince Job. Elihu does not get beyond the thoughts of these friends, and regards Job's sufferings as a divine course of discipline, which will issue in his destruction unless he repents. The thought is the same as that which Eliphaz had before expressed (v. 17). Instead of treating Job as a righteous man, he treats him as one who deserved his sufferings, and whom only blasphemous pride and ignorance deterred from repentance. He has no word of sympathy. He does not make any reference to Job's patience. His answer is no less frigid and formal than that of the three friends. Jerome and Gregory (ibid.) were, however, in the main with the impression of Elihu's speeches. The former saw in him a representative of a false and irreligious philosophy; the latter, a self-confident and vain babbler. Herder shared the same view when he said, "Elihu, a young prophet, assuming, audacious, wise in his own conceit, he heaps up figures without meaning, and appears as an empty shadow. For this reason no one replies to him."

These discourses did not originate with the author of the rest of the work. Their diction, and method of thought, are against this supposition. Every reader of aesthetic sensitivity must feel, when he comes to chap. xxxii., that he has entered a different atmosphere. There is a striking contrast between the assumed paths of this portion of the book and the massive strength of the rest. The language affords no proof that it belongs to a later period of composition than the book as a whole; but there is a fundamental difference in the style, and the impression cannot be avoided that the poet is far behind the writer of the rest of the book in ability. We miss the bold and sublime figures and the ideal thoughts which well up in the rest of the book in inexhaustible fulness. The poet shows his dramatic skill in gradually developing the contrast between Job and his friends, and in such a way as to make us feel incensed with the latter, in spite of some truths they utter, and in sympathy with Job. But the culminating feature in the dramatic art consists in this, that, while the book nowhere defines the central idea, it makes it vivid and lifelike. The Book of Job was not intended for the stage: for the Jews got the theatre for the first time at a much later period, from the Greeks and Romans; and dramatic representations were out of accord with the spirit of the Jewish religion. But a drama is possible, and Elihu's book is an example of such a drama. In the dedication of his Commentary on Job, calls it a tragedy, and justifies the designation from the fact that persons are represented in it as talking, that their speeches are characterized by outbursts of passion, and accusations, of longing for death, and justification before God. The Book of the Hebrew poet is, in fact, no less a tragic hero than the Oidipus of Sophocles. Here Jehovah takes the place of immutable fate. The hero is overwhelmed with mysterious afflictions. He contends with God like a Titan; though, to be sure, all is only the ghostly creation of his mind. The true God finally declares his innocence. But in the mean time his friends prove merciless judges; and nature and grace, fancy and faith, defiance and humility, fill Job's heart. The book does not end with the destruction of the hero by fate, but the end of the hero forever destroys the notion of fate. In the development of this train of thought, the author uses the most elevated style possible. Figure follows figure: all that nature and man can present of the sublime and the massive here passes before us. The contents are draped in the garments of the night, yet flash forth with glory. "The diction of this book," says Luther, "is magnificent and sublime as no other book of Scripture." The greatest poets of all times, especially Shakespeare and Goethe, have drawn from it. Jacobbi well said, that, whether the work be history or invention, the poet was a seer of God. [Thomas Carlyle, in his chapter on Mahomet in his Heroes and Hero-Worship, says, "I call the Book of Job one of the grandest things ever written with pen. One feels, indeed, as if it were not Hebrew, such a noble universality, different from noble patriotism or sectarianism, reigns in it. A noble book, all men's books. It is our first, oldest statement of the never-ending Problem,—man's destiny, and God's ways with him here in this earth... There is nothing written, I think, in the Bible or out of it, of equal literary merit." Mr. Froude calls it a "book which will one day, perhaps, when it is allowed to stand on its own merits, be seen towering up alone, far above all the poetry of the world."

This masterly composition cannot be placed before the reign of Solomon. Oehler, Riehm, Dillman, and others, put it after the reign of
Solomon. But I cannot agree with them: for no work belonging to the Chochmah literature can compare with Job in class, style, existing the Song of Songs, and this is Solomonian. The abundant references to natural history and scientific knowledge in general in Job are explained by the broad, extensive relations of Judaea to other parts of the world under Solomon, to Phoenicia, Egypt, Ophir, etc., mentioned in the book. The relations of Solomon to the other books of the canon also points to this date. The utterances concerning the future are not only the same in tenor, but also often identical in form, with those of the psalms of David's reigns. (Compare Ps. xvii. 15, lxxviii. 10 sq.) In the telling language of Friedrich von Schlegel, Job belongs to the Old Testament books of long after the future. The doctrine about wisdom in Proverbs (i. 9, 8.) declares for the priority of the treatment of the subject in Job (xxviii.). Both authors speak of the preciousness of wisdom and its co-operation in the creation, and sometimes in the same words; but the treatment of Proverbs shows a development upon that of Job, and wisdom appears personified. The agreement between Ps. lxxxviii. and lxxxix. and parts of Job (vii. 7, xiv. 14, xvi. 25, xix. 10, xxx. 94) is striking; and, while it does not prove an identity of authorship, it does indicate that Job was written by one of the wise men who assembled in Solomon's court. This view is held by Rosenmüller, Havernick, Valerian, Schlottmann, Keil, and Hofmann; but the prevailing opinion at present is, that it belongs to a later period,—the period between Isaiah and Jeremiah, that is, between the Assyrian and Babylonian exile. This view is mainly based upon the author's acquaintance with the leading nations of captivity (xii. 23). But as for ourselves, we feel confident that Job was a much read work in the eighth century, and that Amos, Isaiah, and Hesekiah were well acquainted with it.

[Those who hold that the Book of Job was written in a very early age, in the time of Moses, or even earlier, urge its un-Jewish tone and its general spirit, which indicate an early period of the race. The absence of all references, direct and indirect, to the Mosaic law, the temple, the priesthood, and the sacrifices, as well as to Jewish history, is very striking, and is justly emphasized. The difficulty of conceiving of a Jew in the reign of Solomon transferring himself to a pre-Mosaic condition of affairs, and ignoring entirely his own religion, cannot be easily set aside. This view was held largely among the Jews, by the Fathers (Origen, Jerome, etc.), and by many modern commentators, including Berthold, Eichhorn, Lowth, Tayler Lewis, Canon Cook, etc.]


JOBS, Frederick James, D.D., b. at Lincoln, 1812; d. in London, Jan. 3, 1881. He was articled to an architect, but subsequently ordained to the Wesleyan ministry in 1834; rose to eminence, and became president of the conference in 1869. He was a man of great usefulness, and wrote, besides some devotional books, Chapel and School Architecture as appropriate to the Buildings of Non-conformists, London, 1850; America and American Methodism, 1857; Australia, with Notes by the Way on Egypt, Ceylon, Bombay, and the Holy Land, 1862. Joel (יֵּוֶל, Jehovah is God ), the second of the Minor Prophets. From the contents of his prophecy we are led to conclude that he belonged to the kingdom of Judah, and was in Jerusalem at the time of his prophetic activity. He prophesied in the first thirty years of the reign of Joash (877-847 B.C.). The usual reasons given for this view are the following: (1) Amos had Joel's prophecy before him (comp. Amos i. 2 with Joel iii. 16); (2) Joel had the hard fate of Jerusalem and Judah under Joram fresh before his mind, and makes no mention of the Syrians, which he certainly would have done, had he lived after Hazael's campaign against Jerusalem at the end of the reign of Joash (2 Kings xii. 18 sqq.); and (3) he refers to the temple services and priests (i. 9, 13, 14, 17), which points to the worship of Jehovah, which was restored under Joash, and retained for thirty years of his reign. This is the view of...
JOHN THE APOSTLE.

Hitzig, Eduard, Keil, Delitzsch, and others. Hengstenberg, Knobel, and others place his activity under the reigms of Herodean II. and Uzziah (when Amos prophesied). Merx regards the prophecy as a Midrash written after 445 B.C.; [and Professor W. Robertson Smith, in the Encyclopædia Britannica, puts it in the period after Ezra, and adds a confirmation of this view in Joel’s reference to the walls of Jerusalem, chap. ii. 7, 9]. The pre-exile date rests, above all, on the “freshness and originality of Joel’s description,” “the classical form of the prophecy,” the fact that it was in the hands of Amos, and the general character of its contents, which not only do not refer to the Syrians, but presuppose a healthful religious condition for Judah.

The occasion of Joel’s prophecy was a terrible locust scourge, which combined with a drought to completely devastate the land. In the first part (i.1–ii.17) the prophet describes the devastation and the locusts, and the judgment of the world. At the time of the latter, all nations will be gathered to the Valley of Jehoshaphat. The scourge of locusts is to be interpreted literally, and not allegorically, as Jerome, Hengstenberg, Haverick, [Lowth, Pusey] do. The main argument for the allegorical interpretation is the name which is given to the army of locusts (ii. 20). It is designated as the “north-eru.” The locusts usually start from the deserts of Asia and Africa, and pursue a northerly course; and it might seem at first more accurate and natural to explain it of nations. But locusts are also found in the Syrian desert, and might well be blown in a southerly direction without passing over Mount Lebanon. However this may be, the remainder of the description militates against the allegorical interpretation, and also the fact that not a trace of a reference can be found to a hostile invasion before or afterwards in the book. There is no ground for calling in question the Joelic authorship. Peter quotes Joel (ii. 28, 29) in his sermon at the temple (Acts ii. 17, 18), and applies the prophecy to the outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost. Its complete fulfilment we may expect at the revelation of Jesus in glory. The vision of the day of the Lord in Rev. xix. 11 sqq. draws upon the descriptions of Joel and Zechariah (xiv.). [For full literature see Minor Prophets. Special Commentaries by Ursinus (Francké, 1841), Leusden (Joel explicatus, Utr.), 1857, Pococke (Oxford, 1893), Chandler (London, 1735), Baumgarten (Halle, 1756), Justi (Leipzig, 1792), Creder (Halle, 1831), Meier (Tüb., 1841), Wünsche (Leip., 1872), Karle (Leip., 1877), and A. Merx (Halle, 1879). W. L. Platson: Joel, Leipzig, 1885.]

JOHN THE APOSTLE and his Writings. The peculiar and prominent place which John holds among the twelve disciples and the authors of the New Testament, and the critical assaults upon the writings that bear his name, make desirable a comprehensive presentation of his character, activity, and literary remains.

I. LIFE AND CHARACTER OF JOHN. — Among the apostles, by far the most prominent are John, Peter, and Paul. Compared with Peter, impulsive and quick of action, John was of a quiet, thoughtful, and receptive temperament. He treasured up the words of the Lord in his heart, and lost himself in the contemplation of his glory. When Jesus speaks, John does not ask, “What shall I do? Shall I draw the sword against Malchus? Shall I build three tabernacles?” but rather, “What does He do? what does He speak?” It is due to this attitude that his memory, like a mirror, reflected the inner life of the Lord, and retained whole discourses entire. The peculiar majesty and glory of Christ was certainly not hidden from the eyes of the other disciples; but John alone was competent to reproduce them in a vivid description. The other evangelists preserve those discourses and acts of Jesus which produced greater visible effects at the time,—the miracles, the preaching of the Sermon on the Mount, brought together a large throng. John preserves incidents, which, though equally important, were not accompanied with so much display,—the conversations with Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman, and the discussions in the temple. There is more resemblance between John and Paul. They are both of thoughtful, reflective disposition; but Paul’s mind assumes a logical and dialectic form. John is contemplative only. Paul dwells upon the sinner’s appropriation of salvation, John upon its author; Paul upon conversion, John upon the fulness of life in Christ.

John has been called the “Apostle of Love,” because love is a controlling conception in his system. This word, however, occurs as frequently in Paul’s writings, only he uses it in connection with faith. John employs it as the opposite of unbelief; Paul uses it in connection with faithfulness of life in Christ.

John received a religious training. His mother, Salome (Mark xvi. 1; Matt. xx. 20), was a true Israelite, and afterwards a devoted follower of Christ (Mark xv. 40). Tradition points to Bethsaida as the place of his birth. Chrysostom and others speak with confidence on this point. He had some means (John xix. 27), and seems to have been of better connection than the other disciples, for he knew the high priest (John xviii. 15). It is probable that he was a disciple of the Baptist before he was called of Christ. He apprehended the spirit and meaning of that prophet’s preaching better than any of the other disciples (John i. 26–36). As a disciple of Christ, he leaned upon Christ’s bosom, and is called the “disciple whom Jesus loved.” He gave himself up unreservedly to him.

This decision, which marked his attachment to Christ, likewise distinguishes his conception of Christ’s work. Paul depicts the believer in appropriating salvation: John portrays salvation as a victory of the light already won over darkness. Paul treats of sin largely as weakness: John treats of it as iniquity. It was not possible for John to do the work which Paul...
did; but it was his high mission to keep the Church, already established, pure, and to purify it. It was not his mission to extend the Church, but to supplement the activity of the other apostles by contending against the corruption within its pale and the rising Gnosticism.

John’s apostolic activity for the first thirty years after the resurrection was in harmony with his nature,—a quiet and retiring one. After the death of Paul and the destruction of Jerusalem, he entered upon a new stage. The latter is always the spokesman; and even in the year 50, at the council in Jerusalem (Acts xv.) it is Peter and James, not John, who are in the foreground. In the year 58 James and the presbyters alone are left in the city (Acts xxii. 15). In the interval the other apostles seem to have been scattered. An old tradition has it (Clement: Strom., vi. 5) that John left Jerusalem twelve years after the resurrection. He spent the latter part of his life in Ephesus; but he could not have gone there long before Paul’s death (A.D. 64), or there would have been some reference to him in the Epistle to the Ephesians, or at the leave-taking with the elders of Miletus.

The testimony of the Fathers agrees that he presided over the churches of Asia Minor from Ephesus as a centre. Irenaeus states that he lived there till the times of Trajan. His testimony is of peculiar value, for his teacher Polycarp had been a pupil of John.

It is unanimously agreed that he was banished to Patmos. Irenaeus says that this occurred under Domitian; and Jerome gives the more particular date as the fourteenth year of his reign (94–95). But another tradition assigns the exile to the reign of Nero (68). He was permitted by Nerva to return the year following. These are all the data we have of John’s life. The exact date of his death is unknown.

II. The Writings of John divide themselves into two classes. The first includes the Gospel and the Epistles; the second, the Apocalypse.

(1) The Gospel of John is seen at first sight to differ from the first three Gospels. He omits very much that they contain, and adds much new and characteristic matter. It is obvious that he supplements the narratives of the synoptists; and there can hardly be a doubt that it was his design to do so. But in a deeper sense does he supplement their narratives. He delineates with special care the divine nature of Christ, opening his Gospel with a narrative of his divine antecedents, and reporting frequent discourses in which Christ speaks of his eternal relation to the Father. He also portrays the vital union of Christ with believers (John iii. 8, xiv. 16 sqq., xvii. 21–23).

John’s individuality was not the sole factor leading him to give to his Gospel its supplemental character. He was led to do this by the special needs of the Church, and the dangers to which it was exposed.

He awoke to the realization of his special mission in the last years of the first century. At the death of Paul and the destruction of Jerusalem, the Church entered upon a new stage. The Hebrew nation, rejecting the witness of the apostles, had become the Diaspora. Christianity now had to do only with Heathen Rome and with individual Jews as they opposed the Christians in the Roman Empire. The period was past in which Paul was called upon to contend against Judaizing tendencies in Christian congregations. The destruction of Jerusalem had sealed his teaching.

But, in spite of this event, there was a strong party in the Church, which so little understood the meaning, that they continued to cling to the forms of the old dispensation. They were called the sect of the Nazarenes, and in its ultimate form their system was known as Ebionism. They saw in Christ only a lawgiver and a man. This tendency did not reach its full development in John’s time; but his keen foresight discerned it in the future, and he was aroused by it to give his testimony to the eternal Sonship of Christ.

Contemporary with this, the first indications of Gnostic began to make themselves felt. At the bottom a Heathen philosophy, it incorporated some of the doctrines of Christianity, but ignored faith and the atonement. Cerinthus, the first important expounder of this school, taught that the world was not created by God, but by a power distinct from him; that Jesus was the son of Mary and Joseph; that at his baptism he received the aion Christ into union with himself, and, enlightened by it, taught more exalted doctrines concerning God than had ever been taught before. This aion withdrew from Jesus before the passion, so that only the man Jesus suffered on the cross. According to Polycarp, John met Cerinthus in the baths, and it is quite probable that he was obliged to contend against his errors. We are thus led to the conclusion that the Cerinthian Gnosis was the principal cause which induced John to believe that the time had come for him to make known his peculiar gift, which he had hitherto kept concealed. It was his mission, by testifying more emphatically than had been done to the incarnation and divinity of Christ, to lay the last stone in the structure of apostolical teaching. He emphasizes faith in Jesus the Son of God (xx. 31) over against a bare gnosis. To the false speculations which denied now the divinity, now the humanity, of Christ, he opposed his utterances about his eternal relation with the Father, and the revelation of the Father through him. To the mere intellectual striving after knowledge without holiness, he opposed the mystical life of the union with Christ. The best evidence that this is the design of the Gospel is found in the statement of chap. xx. 31: “These are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that, believing, ye may have life in his name.” No sharper antithesis to Cerinthian speculations could be conceived.

(2) A further proof that this was the purpose of the evangelist is found in his First Epistle. This work resembles the Gospel in language, style, tone, and ideas. In chap. ii. 12–14 the writer speaks six times of the object for which he had written, and was then writing. Must not these statements, then, beyond a doubt, refer to something else than the Epistle,—to the Gospel itself? If this point be well taken, then the Epistle assumes the character of an accompanying document, as J. P. Lange and Hug have held in com-
mon with myself. Be this granted or not, it may
with certainty be deduced from 1. John iv. 2 sq.
that the apostle had to contend with such as de-
nied that Jesus was the Christ. It was for the
purpose of convincing of this that he wrote his
Gospel (John xx. 31).
(3) The Apocalypse is the second division of
John's literary labors. Here is revealed to the
soul the contrast between light and darkness, true
and falsehood, which is the underlying theme of
the Gospel, to its final consummation. John alone,
whose mind had been occupied with these con-
tacts, was capable of receiving these revelations.
In chap. i. 1 he declares himself definitely as the
author of the book. Polycrates pronounces him
who leaned on the Saviour's bosom to have re-
ceived the revelation, like a priest of the Old-
Testament dispensation, by means of the Urim and
Thummim. [Dr. Ebrard assigns Revelation to
the traditional date A.D. 98; but most critics now
assign it to A.D. 95-7.]
(4) The Genuineness of the Fourth Gospel and
the First Epistle is established by incontrovertible
proofs. There can be only the choice between
genuineness and designed fraud; for the writer
announces himself to have been an eye-witness
of Christ's life (John i. 14, xix. 35; 1 John i. 1).
Undesigned evidence in favor of the John-
anean authorship is to be found in the Gospel itself,
in the evident determination to avoid the mention
of the sons of Zebedee (John i. 35, xii. 23, xvii. 15,
xix. 26, xx. 2), in constantly referring to himself
as the "disciple whom Jesus loved," in giving to
Thomas his cognomen (xi. 19), etc. But to this
indirect testimony comes a strong and unbroken
chain of external testimonies. In the early part
of the second century we find a number of remi-
niscences and echoes of John which cannot fail to
prove its genuineness. These testimonies and
other facts cannot be explained on the supposition
that the Gospel is a posthumous product. Fifty or
sixty years after John's death we find it gener-
ally received, and held in highest esteem. The concur-
rence of evidence is so strong, that it was not till
late in the history of rationalism, that its genu-
ineness was attacked. It remained for the Tubingen
school to do this, who held that the author of the
Gospel cannot be the same as the writer of the
Apocalypse. But, whatever differences of idiom
there may be, the spirit that pervades the two
writings is the same; and the variations of lan-
guage are explained by the difference of the theme
and the time of their composition.
The Appendix (chap. xx.) of the Gospel is also
to be taken into account as evidence for its genu-
ineness. This chapter bears marks of being
written by the apostle himself (ver. 24). It was
written by him after the first composition, and
added to the Gospel, not by his own hand, but by
the hand of another, perhaps by the presbyter
John (vers. 24, 25). He bore witness to the au-
thorship; and this Appendix must have been add-
ed very soon after the composition of the Gospel,
as it is not wanting in a single manuscript.

I. Biographical and Critical. — Fr. Trench:
Life and Character of St. John the Evangelist (Lon-
don, 1830); Dean Stanley: Sermons and Essays
on the Apostolic Age (3d ed., 1874, pp. 234-281);
Krenkel: D. Apostel Johannes (Leipzig, 1871);
J. Catrigan: Ecclesiæ Episcopi de obitu Ioannis
apostoli narratio, ex versione J. Carneini secuti V.
latine (Wien, 1877); Macdonald: The Life and
Writings of St. John (New York, 1877); Niese:
Das Leben des Apostel Johannes und das apoca-
culis: John, whom Jesus loved (New York,
1878). Compare the biographical sketches in the
Introductions to the Commentaries of Lücke,
Lange, Luthardt, Godet, etc.

II. Doctrinal. — The Johannine type of doc-
trine is expounded by Neander (1847), From-
mann (D. Johann. Lehrbegriff, Leipzig, 1839);
C. Reinhold Küstlin (1843), Reuss (La Théol.
johannique, Paris 1879), Schmid, Baer, Hilgen-
feld (1849 and 1863), F. Weis (D. Johann.
Lehrbegriff, 1882), and in Bibl. Theol. des N. T.,

I. Commentaries on the Gospel. — Lampe
(1724, 3 vols.), Lücke (1820; 3d ed., 1843), Tho-
luck (1827; 7th ed., 1857), Hengstenberg
(1863; 2d ed., 1867; English translation, 1865),
Luthardt (1852; 2d ed., entirely rewritten, 1875,
1878; translated by Gregory), De Wette-Brück-
ergy (5th ed., 1860; 3d ed. by Weisse, 1880).
Ewald (1861), Godet (1865; 2d ed., 1877;
3d ed., 1881-85, 3 vols.; translated and edited
by Prof. Timothy Dwight, N. Y., 1886, 2 vols.),
Lange (as translated and enlarged by Schaff,
New York and Edinburgh, 1871). Westcott
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John the Baptist, son of the priest Zacharias and Elisabeth; born six months before Jesus, and probably in the early part of the second half of the year 749 A.U.C. (B.C. 5), in a city of Judah, according to a Jewish tradition, Hebron or Jutta. His birth was announced by an angel of the Lord (Luke i. 13), who prophesied that he should be anointed with the spirit and power of Elijah. For thirty years we hear nothing of him, except that he was in the deserts (Luke i. 80). John was more than a reformer and prophet. His appearance was that of an ascetic. His clothing consisted of a garment of camel's hair bound by a leathern girdle; his food, locusts and wild honey (Matt. iii. 4, etc.). The angelic announcement that he should drink neither wine nor strong drink seems to indicate that he took the vows of a Nazarite. John stands out in sharp contrast to the manners of his age; and his message, to its ways of thinking. The central doctrine of his preaching was in opposition to the righteousness of works,—repentance in view of the near approach of the kingdom of God. With his preaching he associated a baptism of repentance looking to the forgiveness of sins (Matt. iii. 11; Luke iii. 3; Acts xiii. 24). It was a confession of personal guilt (Matt. iii. 6), and an invitation into the circle of those who were expecting the kingdom of heaven. It was, however, a baptism only of water, as opposed to the baptism of the Spirit and fire, which was introduced by Christ (Matt. iii. 11; John i. 26, etc.).

John's fame extended far and wide through the land, and spread among all classes. Throngs came to his baptism at Bethabara, of publicans and soldiers, as well as Pharisees and Sadducees (Matt. iii. 7, xi. 7, etc.). There was a prevalent expectation that he might prove to be the Messiah; and the Sanhedrin sent out a delegation to question him about it (Luke iii. 15; John i. 20; Acts xiii. 25). His influence over the masses was very great; and it was dangerous, in their presence, to deny that he was a prophet (Matt. xxii. 26, etc.). John was more than reformer: he was the forerunner of Christ. He represented himself, in accordance with Isa. xi. 3, as a "voice crying in the wilderness," etc. (John i. 23).

With ingenuous humility he rejected all claims of Messianic dignity, and points to the Greater One, whose shoes' latchet he was not worthy to unloose (Matt. iii. 11; John i. 27; Acts xiii. 25). He designated Christ more particularly as pre-existent to himself, though his junior in birth (John i. 30), as the Son of God (John i. 34), and, with reference to Isa. iii. 7, as the "Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world" (John i. 29, 36). His public activity did not last more than two years at the most. He was cast into the prison of Machaerus for his bold arraignmment of Herod Antipas for his adulterous connexion with Herodias (John iii. 24, etc.), and was subsequently beheaded, in obedience to an oath the king, in a moment of volupitous festivity, made to Salome, Herodias' daughter (Matt. xiv. 3 sqq., etc.). According to Josephus, the reason for the beheading was jealousy at John's preponderant influence with the people (Antiq., XVIII. 5, 2). The mission of the deputation to Christ from his prison is not to be attributed to any doubt that he was the Messiah, but to a feeling of discontent with his slow and unexpected method of procedure (Matt. xi. 2; Luke vii. 19, etc.). Christ pronounced John the Baptist to be the greatest among the prophets, although less than the least in the kingdom of heaven (Luke vii. 28). He was a "burning and shining light" (John v. 33, 35), and the Elijah whose coming prophets had predicted (Mal. iii. 1; John i. 21, etc.). He did no miracle (John x. 41); but he prepared the way of the Lord and stood as a self-denial, intrepid courage, and childlike humility. He
JOHN.

represents the completion of the old dispensation, which, like the morning star, was paling before the rising of the new, upon which John (I. 8) shone. 

---See the various Commentaries and Lives of Christ [HOLMES: John the Baptist, Bampton Lecture, London, 1783; REYNOLDS: John the Baptist, London, 1874; SYMONTING: Fox Claman-
tis, Life and Ministry of John the Baptist, London, 1827].

---John is the name of twenty-three popes.---John I., Saint, b. in Siena, and made Bishop of Rome, Aug. 13, 853. He was sent by Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths, to Byzantium, to repre-
sent the cause of the Arians, against whom the emperor, Justin I., had issued an edict. Tradition says he was received with much honor at the Eastern capital. Returning to Ravenna, he was thrown into prison, where he died May 18, 526.---John II. (Dec. 31, 582—May 27, 595) had to make many queer shifts between the dogmatical precepts of the Emperor Justinian and the dog-
matical decisions of his predecessor, Hormidas.

---John III. (July 25, 607—May 13, 610).---John IV., b. in Dalmatia, and consecrated Pope, Dec. 25, 640; d. Oct. 12, 642. He was zealous in estab-
lishing monasteries. In the debate on the Mono-
thetic confession of the Patriarch Sergius, he placed himself at the head of the opposite party, and defended the orthodoxy of his predecessor, Honorius. His synod in Rome of 641 condemned Monotheletism.---John V. (May or July, 685—Aug. 2, 698) was a Syrian by birth, and spent most of the time of his reign in bed. His alleged letters are probably spurious.---John VI. (Oct. 30, 701—Jan. 10, 705).---John VII. (March 1, 705—Oct. 18, 707) received from Justinian II. the canons of the Council of Trulla, but dared not pronounce upon them.---John VIII., a Roman by birth, and made Bishop of Rome, Dec. 14, 752. He was a bold spirit, of restless ambition, and skilled in state-
craft. He conceived large plans of extending the territory of the Pope over all of Central and Southern Italy, and of using the emperors in the interest of the papal power in Italy. They were all shattered. He crowned King Charles the Bald as Emperor, 873. The king made him large donations of territory. In 881 he crowned his suc-
cessor, Charles the Fat, expecting to get aid against the Saracens. In this he failed. He re-
ognized Photius as Patriarch of Constantinople in the hope of securing the aid of the Byzantine
emperor to further his schemes in Italy. Finding himself disappointed, he retracted the recognition. He confirmed Methodius as bishop among the Slavs. He was murdered with a hammer, Dec. 15, 882. Three hundred and eight of John's letters are extant. See MANN: Concil. T. xvi.

---John IX. (June, 898—July, 900) held two synods, one in Rome, which gave Formosus redress, and another at Ravenna, against robbery of church property. MANN: Concil. xviii. ---John X., raised, by the influence of the profligate Theo-
dora, to the sees of Bologna and Ravenna, and in 914 took the bishop of Rome. He gave himself up to worldly amusements, and was the first of the popes to enter armed into the camp. He led a successful campaign against the marauding Saracens. He was suffocated in prison in 929.---John XI. (March, 931—January, 936), a son of Marozia and Sergius III., was at one time impre-
donced by his half-brother, Alberic.---John XII. (Octavian) followed his father as Prince (Patricius) of Rome, for, a year after John's death, 929, he was called, in his sixteenth or eighteenth year, to the papal office, Dec. 16, 935. Like his predecessors, he was ambitious to secure the supposed temporal rights of the Pope, and called in Otto I. across the Alps to his aid against King Berengar and the Greeks. Although Otto promised to uphold the person of John, and to continue in the inher-
tance of Peter, yet the struggle between the Papacy and the emperors began with him. He secured from John an oath never to conclude a treaty with Berengar and the Greeks. John for-
got his pledge, and in 963 was forced to flee before Otto as he returned in triumph to the city. The Romans were compelled to take an oath never to elect or consecrate a pope without the consent of the emperor or his son. John led a wan
t life, and the Lateran rang with sounds of impure revelry and pagan oaths over games of chance. He was convicted, by a synod held in St. Peter's in 968, of various crimes, such as murder, for-
nication, perjury, and deposed. After the de-
parture of Otto, he returned to the city, was re-instated by a second synod, but died suddenly, on May 14, 964, in an adulterous bed, of ap-
oplexy. See GIESEBRECHT: Gesch. d. deutsc.

---John XIII. (Oct. 1, 965—Sept. 6, 972) was expelled from Rome by the nobility, but was restored and upheld by the Emperor Otto, who, at a synod of Ravenna, guaranteed to the Roman see the possession, not only of the city and circle of Ravenna, but every estate which it had ever held. Lives of him in MURATORI: Script. rerum Ital., T. iii. pt. ii. ---John XIV. (November or December, 983—Aug. 13, 994) perished in a dungeon of the Castle of St. Angelo, where he had been confined by Boniface VII. ---John XV. (Sep-
tember, 985—April, 996) was expelled from Rome by John Crescentius, but managed to return, and to fill his private coffers with the wealth of the Church. ---John XVI. (May, 997—March, 998), a Greek by birth, was made Pope by John Crescent-

ius, but 973. The king made him large donations of territory. In 881 he crowned his suc-
cessor, Charles the Fat, expecting to get aid against the Saracens. In this he failed. He re-
ognized Photius as Patriarch of Constantinople in the hope of securing the aid of the Byzantine
emperor to further his schemes in Italy. Finding himself disappointed, he retracted the recognition. He confirmed Methodius as bishop among the Slavs. He was murdered with a hammer, Dec. 15, 882. Three hundred and eight of John's letters are extant. See MANN: Concil. T. xvi.

---John IX. (June, 898—July, 900) held two synods, one in Rome, which gave Formosus redress, and another at Ravenna, against robbery of church property. MANN: Concil. xviii. ---John X., raised, by the influence of the profligate Theo-
dora, to the sees of Bologna and Ravenna, and in 914 took the bishop of Rome. He gave himself up to worldly amusements, and was the first of the popes to enter armed into the camp. He led a successful campaign against the marauding Saracens. He was suffocated in prison in 929.---John XI. (March, 931—January, 936), a son of Marozia and Sergius III., was at one time impre-
donced by his half-brother, Alberic.---John XII. (Octavian) followed his father as Prince (Patricius) of Rome, for, a year after John's death, 929, he was called, in his sixteenth or eighteenth year, to the papal office, Dec. 16, 935. Like his predecessors, he was ambitious to secure the supposed temporal rights of the Pope, and called in Otto I. across the Alps to his aid against King Berengar and the Greeks. Although Otto promised to uphold the person of John, and to continue in the inher-
tance of Peter, yet the struggle between the Papacy and the emperors began with him. He secured from John an oath never to conclude a treaty with Berengar and the Greeks. John for-
got his pledge, and in 963 was forced to flee before Otto as he returned in triumph to the city. The Romans were compelled to take an oath never to elect or consecrate a pope without the consent of the emperor or his son. John led a wan
t life, and the Lateran rang with sounds of impure revelry and pagan oaths over games of chance. He was convicted, by a synod held in St. Peter's in 968, of various crimes, such as murder, for-
nication, perjury, and deposed. After the de-
parture of Otto, he returned to the city, was re-instated by a second synod, but died suddenly, on May 14, 964, in an adulterous bed, of ap-
oplexy. See GIESEBRECHT: Gesch. d. deutsc.

---John XIII. (Oct. 1, 965—Sept. 6, 972) was expelled from Rome by the nobility, but was restored and upheld by the Emperor Otto, who, at a synod of Ravenna, guaranteed to the Roman see the possession, not only of the city and circle of Ravenna, but every estate which it had ever held. Lives of him in MURATORI: Script. rerum Ital., T. iii. pt. ii. ---John XIV. (November or December, 983—Aug. 13, 994) perished in a dungeon of the Castle of St. Angelo, where he had been confined by Boniface VII. ---John XV. (Sep-
tember, 985—April, 996) was expelled from Rome by John Crescentius, but managed to return, and to fill his private coffers with the wealth of the Church. ---John XVI. (May, 997—March, 998), a Greek by birth, was made Pope by John Crescent-

ius, but 973. The king made him large donations of territory. In 881 he crowned his suc-
cessor, Charles the Fat, expecting to get aid against the Saracens. In this he failed. He re-
ognized Photius as Patriarch of Constantinople in the hope of securing the aid of the Byzantine
emperor to further his schemes in Italy. Finding himself disappointed, he retracted the recognition. He confirmed Methodius as bishop among the Slavs. He was murdered with a hammer, Dec. 15, 882. Three hundred and eight of John's letters are extant. See MANN: Concil. T. xvi.

---John IX. (June, 898—July, 900) held two synods, one in Rome, which gave Formosus redress, and another at Ravenna, against robbery of church property. MANN: Concil. xviii. ---John X., raised, by the influence of the profligate Theo-
dora, to the sees of Bologna and Ravenna, and in 914 took the bishop of Rome. He gave himself up to worldly amusements, and was the first of the popes to enter armed into the camp. He led a successful campaign against the marauding Saracens. He was suffocated in prison in 929.---John XI. (March, 931—January, 936), a son of Marozia and Sergius III., was at one time impre-
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John a heretic, secured, through a synod in Rome, his deposition and the election of Nicolaus V. to his place. John sanctioned the custom of saluting the Virgin with three Ave Maris in honor of the Trinity, deprived the towns of the right of electing their bishops, and left behind an immense sum of money, which he had secured by annats, and otherwise. He died Dec. 4, 1354.

—John XXIII., a Neapolitan of fine talents, but corrupt morals; d. Dec. 22, 1410. He secured, by bribes and threats, his election, on May 17, 1410, to the papal throne. He was deposed, and imprisoned in Heidelberg; but, escaping, he fell at the feet of Martin V., and was made cardinal-bishop of Tusculum. G. VOIGT.

JOHN, Popess. See Joan, Popf.

JOHN IV., Jejunator (the Faster), Patriarch of Constantinople 582-593; had a high reputation for piety. He became involved in difficulties with Popes Pelagius II. and Gregory I., by following the precedent of some of his predecessors in assuming the title of Ecumenical Patriarch. Gregory was intensely aroused by this assumption, declaring it to be a suggestion of Satan, and an indication of the near advent of Antichrist. John soon died, and the Greek Church placed his name on the calendar of the saints. A later and untrustworthy tradition states that Gregory had excommunicated him before his death.

The writings attributed to John (Libellus penitentialis and Tractatus de Confessione et penitentia) are of very doubtful authenticity. See Life of John, by Patriarch NICEPHORUS, and the Church History of SCHNURER.

—WAGENMANN.

JOHN X., Patriarch of Constantinople, known for his connection with the measures of the Emperor Michael Paleologus, looking to the union of Christendom. He at first refused his aid, and declared the Latin heretics, for which he was thrown into prison. He there had leisure to investigate the history of the dissensions of the Greek and Latin churches, and to change his mind. He was released, and made patriarch, but, after the death of the emperor, retired to a cloister in 1283. He was again restored, and again exiled, dying 1298. The Greek Church excludes his name from the list of saints.

JOHN OF ANTIOCH, surnamed Scholasticius; b. at Sirimis, in the neighborhood of Antioch; practised as an advocate in the latter city, and was a presbyter of the Church, when, during the reign of Justinian, he was sent as aposciarius to Constantinople. In the Monophysite controversies the emperor opposed the orthodox; and, as he could not compel Eutychius the patriarch to submit to his views, he had him deposed by a synod of 564, and John placed in his stead. John, however, is chiefly known to us through his Collectio Canorum, which he made while presbyter of Antioch. It contains eighty-six so-called apostolical canons. The Nomocanon, containing some additional capitula eclesiastica and a number of civil laws, is also ascribed to him. Both collections are found (Greek and Latin) in H. JUSTELLI: Bibliotheca Juris Canonici, Paris, 1802, t. ii. The date of his death is generally fixed at 578.

JOHN OF AVILA, the modern apostle of Andalusia; b. at Almodóvar del Campo, in the diocese of Toledo, 1502; d. at Montilla, May 10, 1569, began to study law at Salamanca, when he was fourteen years old, but retired soon after to his home, where for three years he led a life of the severest asceticism. After studying theology at Alcalá, under Domingo de Soto, he began to preach at Seville, Cordova, Granada, everywhere producing the deepest impression. He was summoned before the Inquisition, but refused to answer. He was offered the highest preferments in the Church, but declined to accept. His health failed, however; and the last twenty years of his life he had to confine himself to teaching in a monastery. Several of his works, De los malos lenguages del Mundo, Epistolario espiritual, were translated into French, English, and German. A collected edition appeared in Madrid, 1757, in nine volumes quarto. His life has been written by Luis de Granada and Nicolas Antonio (Bibliotheca Hispana Nova, I.). BENRATH.

JOHN OF CHUR (Coire), surnamed Rüberg. The term “Friends of God” is applied to the mystics and pietists in the latter part of the fourteenth century, who yearned for a more vital type of religion than they found in the Church. Here and there they formed brotherhoods, and not infrequently laymen were their leaders. They flourished especially in the Rhineland, Cologne, Strassburg, and the Netherlands. Eckart (d. about 1299) and Tauler (1290—1361) belonged to their number, and also the author of the work called The German Theology.

John of Chur, the son of a rich merchant, was one of the “Friends of God.” Suddenly arrested in a wild career, he gave himself up entirely to mystical contemplations. He renounced all his fortune, to which he had fallen heir by the death of his father, and distributed it for benevolent purposes. He regarded suffering as a special gift of divine grace; and even evil thoughts, doubts, and impure desires, he believed were to be patiently endured, rather than striven against, for they were dispensed by God. He taught that the perfect man “has become one with God when he wants nothing else except what God wills.” About 1357 he sought to unite his friends who were of the same spirit into a society. From indications in his writings, we conclude that Chur, or Coire, in the canton of St. Gall, near the castle Rutberg, in Basel, was his native city. In 1365 he determined to separate himself from the bustle of the town, and led with two companions, in a miraculous manner, by a black dog, he wandered to a mountain, where he built a chapel. He died about the year 1380. Little is known definitely about his life; but I am led by my investigations to conclude that he built his chapel on a mountain in the canton St. Gall, near the castle Rüberg. For this reason I have given him the distinguishing surname of Rüberg. Among the printed writings of John of Chur the principal one is The Book of the Five Men (D. Buch von d. 5 Mannen).


JOHN OF DAMASCUS, surnamed Chryso- rhoas (gold pouring) on account of his eloquence, and called, among the Arabs, Mansur, is the last of the Greek Fathers, and the most authoritative theologian in the Oriental Church. The main
JOHN OF DAMASCUS.

facts of his life are taken from John of Jerusalem, who wrote in the middle of the tenth century in a legendary style. He was born in Damascus (then under Saracenic rule), at the close of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century. His father, Sergius, placed him under the instruction of the Italian monk Cosmas. At the death of his father, he was raised to high official position by the caliph. About the year 730 the Emperor Leo the Isaurian, out of revenge for a book John had written in defence of images, the use of which he was seeking to abolish, convicted him, by the aid of a forged letter, of treason to the caliph, who ordered one of his hands to be cut off. John prostrated himself before the Virgin, who restored the maimed part. Out of gratitude to her, whom he calls the “Mother of God, and mistress of all creation” (De Fide Orthod., iii. 12, iv. 14), he renounced his office, to which he had been recalled, distributed his goods amongst his relatives and in alms, and entered the convent of St. Sabas, near Jerusalem. He was subsequently ordained presbyter of Jerusalem. In the last period of his life he defended with great zeal, against the Emperor Constantine Capynomus, the use of images, travelling through Syria, and even going to Constantinople, in this interest. It is probable that he returned to the convent, where he died some time between the years 754 and 787.

John’s principal work is the Fountain of Knowledge (πηγὴ γνώσεως), which consists of three parts,—an application of Aristotle’s Dialectic to theology, a Treatise on Heresies, and An Accurate Examination of the most Orthodox Faith (επωδιαμωτηρίας πίστεως ιδανικῶς). He developed a system of theology, using philosophy in the service of theology, comparing the latter to a princess who is waited upon by maids. In this, as also by his confessed dependence upon tradition, he shows himself to be the forerunner of mediaval scholasticism. In the department of theology proper he affirms that God’s nature is unknowable, and that therefore negative attributes only can be predicated of him; e.g., infinity, incomprehensibility, etc. But, in his relations to that which is not himself, we may speak of him as good, just, etc. He vindicates the arguments for God’s existence, instancing the cosmological proof, and that which argues from imperfect being to the idea of a perfect personal God. He investigates the Trinity, and finds in it a union of the fundamental ideas of Heathenism and Judaism, in that the plurality, as well as unity, is preserved. He finds an analogy to the trinitarian persons in the mind, word, and breath. In consonance with the Oriental Fathers, he teaches the subordination of the Second and Third Persons. His doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit is a modification of the Latins and approaches nearer that of the Latit Fathers: “The Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son” (De Fide Ortho, i. 8). With reference to the decree of predestination, he says that God foresees our acts of free will, but does not fore-ordain them. In the department of Christology, John presses the reality and full validity of both natures, but denies to Christ all spiritual growth, and that his prayer was in the true sense prayer; it being only a means to teach men by example. He was, with respect to the nature of Christ, to restore what sin had ruined. Sin has its origin in the freedom of the will. By the Fall, man forfeited his immortality, but did not entirely lose the freedom of the will. God had made provision beforehand for the contingency of sin, creating woman, as well as man, that the race might be continued by propagation, and forming him with the capacity of suffering, that through it, after the Fall, he might be chastened (ii. 28). Punishment is an act of justice, but has also an educational purpose. Christ suffered death as a ransom to redeem us from the Devil (iii. 18, 27). God hereby asserts his justice, and manifests his love. Satan had a just claim to the race, which had to be paid off. The benefits of the atonement are appropriated through the choice of our own free will and the continued activity of Christ through the Spirit in the heart. In baptism the Spirit identifies himself with the water at the prayer of consecration, and works, in believers, regeneration. In the Lord’s Supper the elements are changed into the body and blood of Christ, and become part of the essence (σωματικῶς) of our souls and bodies. Although he gives no fully developed theory of transubstantiation, yet he teaches it rhetorically, and also that the sacrament is a bloodless sacrifice.

In addition to his great work, a number of smaller writings have come down to us under his name. He commented upon the Pauline Epistles, wrote homilies, and composed some fine hymns (of which one of the most beautiful is the resurrection hymn found in many English hymn-books, “The Day of Resurrection, Earth, tell it out abroad,” (αναφορις ἡμείς). The interesting romance of Barlaam and Josaph, in which monastic life is held up to admiration, may have been edited by him.


JOHN, Monophysite bishop of Ephesus; lived in the sixth century. He is the author of a Church History, in three parts, from the time of the earliest Roman emperors to 585. A part of it was discovered in 1853, among some Syriac manuscripts, and edited by Cureton, under the title The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John, Bishop of Ephesus, Oxford, 1853; English translation by R. Payne Smith, Oxf., 1860. Nestle.

JOHN OF MONTE CORVINO, the apostle of the Mongols; b. in Monte Corvino, Southern Italy, about 1230; d. 1332. He went into Persia, and proved very successful in winning the Mongols to Christianity. He arrived in Italy in 1288, to report in person about the great work. In 1291 he was commissioned to labor amongst the people of China, whose emperor, Kubilai, had expressed a desire to have Christian teachers. He dwelt utterly alone for eleven years, surrounded by Nestorians, and suffering violent persecution. He baptized six thousand heathen, translated the Psalms and New Testament, and gathered a
JOHN OF SALISBURY. 1195

JOHN NEPOMUK.

school of boys. In 1305 seven assistants were sent to his aid, who carried to him the title of Archbishop of Pekin.

JOHN OF SALISBURY (called also Parvus, the Little), b. of Saxon parentage, between 1110 and 1120, in Salisbury (Sarum); d. in France, Oct. 25, 1180. He went to France, as the custom then was, and studied under Abelard and other teachers. He became eminent for his attainments in philosophy and theology. In 1148 he returned to England, with letters of recommendation from Bernard of Clairvaux, and Peter the Cistercian abbot. Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, appointed him his chaplain and secretary. The responsibility of the ecclesiastical concerns of Great Britain largely devolved upon him. He stood in relations of close intimacy with popes Eugenius III. and Adrian IV. By his influence, the claims of Alexander III. were recognized in England as against those of Victor IV. He was the intimate adviser of Thomas à Becket, and shared his misfortunes, going into exile with him to France. After that prelate’s murder, he zealously assumed the advocacy of his cause. After 1176 he was chosen bishop of Chartres, and lived to administer its affairs four years. One of the last acts of his life was a speech at the Lateran Council (1179), in which he warned against ecclesiastical assumption, and urged the gospel as the rule of life.

John's writings consist of many Letters to popes and other dignitaries, a work on ancient and Christian philosophy, entitled Ethica, and two works on ecclesiastical and political ethics, designed for princes and statesmen, and entitled Politica and Metalogia. He also wrote Lives of Anselm and Thomas à Becket, whose latter sufferings he does not hesitate to compare with the passion of our Lord. His complete works were edited, in 5 vols., by GILES (Oxford, 1848), and MONE (Patrol. Lat., vol. xxii.). See H. BUTLER: Joh. v. Salisbury, Berlin, 1842; SCHAER: Schweiz., 1862; WAGENMANN.

JOHN, Patriarch of Thessalonica at the close of the seventh and the beginning of the eighth centuries; was noted as a defender of image-worship; and wrote on that subject a dialogue between a Jew and a Christian, of which an extract was read aloud at the second council of Nicaea. See MANSI: Conc. XIII. p. 156.

JOHN (Eleemosynarius, the Almsgiver), so called because of his extraordinary benevolence; Patriarch of Constantinople from 806 to 816, when he died in the island of Cypris. His influence before the persecution of the Persians. It is pleasing to add that benevolence was not his only virtue. He was a great lover of peace, forgiving towards his enemies, and willing to bear patiently his own ills, while he helped others to bear theirs. He is commemorated upon Jan. 28, and under that date the Bollandists tell many edifying tales about him.

JOHN FREDERICK, son of John the Constant, and elector of Saxony 1532-1547; b. at Torgau, June 30, 1503; d. March 3, 1554. Brought up in the lap of the Reformation, he became its unwavering advocate. Like his father, he was an intimate of most intimate friendship with Luther, with whom he carried on an uninterrupted corre-

spondence. He increased the endowment of the university of Wittenberg from the sequestrated revenues of convents, and in 1548 founded the university of Jena. His relations to the imperial court were unpleasant. In 1536 he entered into a re-affirmation of the Smalcald league, by which the Protestant princes bound themselves to mutual protection for ten years. In 1544 Charles was left free to give his whole attention to affairs in Germany. A war broke out. Frederick was finally defeated, and taken prisoner, at Mühlberg, April 24, 1547. He remained in prison till 1552; and the electoral office was conferred upon his nephew, Moritz. He lived as a subject for two years after he was set at liberty. His fidelity under many vicissitudes has confirmed the waning courage of thousands. See BURKHARDT: D. Gesch. der religiösen Wissenschaft in Deutschland, 2nd ed., 1858; and the Histories of the Reformation.

JOHN, surnamed Lackland, king of England, May 26, 1199—Oct. 19, 1216; was born Dec. 24, 1167; the youngest son of Henry II. In 1205 his quarrel with the Church and the Pope began. The see of Canterbury was vacant. The monks elected their sub-prior, Reginald; and the king nominated John de Gray, bishop of Norwich. Neither the one nor the other pleased the suffragan bishops. All parties appealed to the Pope; and Innocent III. appointed Stephen Langton archbishop of Canterbury. As the king refused to recognize this appointment, the Pope laid interdict on his whole kingdom 1208, and excommunicated him personally 1209. John, however, who did not seem to care much about the Pope, went on his own way, very successful in curbing the refractory clergy, and suppressing occasional revolts. Innocent then determined to burst the last bomb. In 1211 he deposed John, and charged Philippe II., king of France, with the execution of the decree. This took effect. John, a loose, cowardly character, sometimes made audacious by his cruelty, or stubborn by his sensuality, immediately submitted, and not only accepted Stephen Langton, but even consented to hold his own kingdom as a fief of the papal see, and took an oath of fealty to Innocent. Utterly disgusted at this humiliation, and generally irritated by his irregularities, the barons rose against him, and compelled him to sign the Magna Carta, the basis of English freedom, at Runnymede, June 15, 1215. Innocent, now his ally, tried to come to his rescue, and condemned the charter. But a large national party was formed, comprising not only the barons, but also the clergy and the cities; and, in the war which ensued, John lost one part of the country after another, until at last he became a true lackland. Having nearly escaped being drowned by fording the Wes, he died at Newark Castle, from dysentery, the result of gluttony and fatigue.

JOHN NEPOMUK, the most popular national saint of Bohemia; canonized by Benedict XIII. in 1729; b. between 1330 and 1340, in Pomuk; suffered martyrdom at Prague, March 20(?), 1383. The facts of his life are involved in obscurity. According to the Jesuit Bohuslav Balbinus (1670), he studied at the university of Prague, and afterwards became preacher at the cathedral. He was the confessor of Queen Joanna. His husband, King Wenzel, sought in vain, by tempting promises, to induce him to reveal the matter of her
confessions. He subsequently resorted to imprisonment and torture to gain his end. Finding himself still unsuccessful, and incensed by a sermon which John preached in the cathedral, and in which he applied to himself the words, "In a little while ye shall not see me," the king ordered him to be apprehended, under cover of the night, and thrown from the bridge into the Moldau (1389). According to the same authority, murder and imprisonment were performed in connection with his body. Thousands of lights appeared on the river, and his corpse was thrown upon a sand-bar. A heavenly odor issued from it, and the sick were cured at his shrine. Much of this account must be regarded as legendary. The facts are probably these: a John of Pomuk did live in the fourteenth century, was raised to high ecclesiastical dignity, and afterwards thrown, by command of the king, into the Moldau. But the most authentic sources put the date ten years later, in 1393 (March 20), and know nothing of his being the confessor of the queen. They give conflicting reasons for the violent treatment of the king. These differences led, as early as 1541, to the supposition, and fully developed the legendary details. But an able investigator, John Dabrowsky (1787), refuted the hypothesis, and has finally settled it that there was only one. The tradition that John was the queen's confessor can be traced back to the year 1471, and no farther.


JOHN PHILOPONUS (called also ALEXANDRUS, and Grammaticus), who lived in the latter part of the fifth, and first part of the sixth century, won a place among the philosophical and theological writers of his age. The chronology of his life is very uncertain, and no details are known. He was an Aristotelian in philosophy, and, in the Christological discussions of the mass, until the convention of an ecumenical council. He acknowledged obedience to the emperor, except where it conflicted with the honor of God and his soul's welfare. At the diet of Augsburg, in 1530, his conduct was heroic. In spite of the slighting treatment of Charles V., he did not retreat a step from his evangelical position, but determined to stand "by the imperishable Word of God." On Feb. 27, 1531, he entered into a league of defence with Protestant cities and princes for six years, which forced upon the emperor the religious peace of Nurnberg of July 23, 1532. On the 16th of August he was suddenly attacked with apoplexy and returned to himself to the Egyptian party, and was a Monophyist. His principal theological work, the Διατηρησις, is lost, and known only by quotations. He held, that, if Christ had more than one nature, he had more than one person. He was unjustly reported by Leontius to be the founder of theUnitas. He sought in another work, De Eternitate Mundi, to establish the Christian doctrine of the creation without the aid of the Bible. He also wrote works on the six days of creation, and on the date of the Paschal Supper, putting it on the thirteenth day of the month, one day before the Mosaic passover. He was a prolific author. There is no complete edition of his works extant. See SCHARFENBERG: De Johanne Philop., Lips., 1789.

JOHN SCHOLASTICUS, a monk of the latter part of the sixth century, and a zealous advocate of the monastic life; became abbot of a convent on Mount Sinai, and died, at the age of one hundred, in 606. He received the name of Climacus, from a work entitled κίμαν τοῦ παραδειγματος. He here gives a sketch of the conditions of the soul through which men pass in their progress to the perfect life. This course begins with the forsaking of the world, and mortification of the passions, and ends with the "perfect life."

LIT.—DANIEL: Monarchi Vita Johannis Climaci, etc. GASS.

JOHN THE CONSTANT, Elector of Saxony 1525-32; one of the most zealous of the prince supporters of the Reformation. Born March 30, 1495; of the Duchy of Burgundy (who had assassinated the Duke of Orleans, the brother of the king), a supporter of the Reformation, and also the Council of Constance (sess. 5), and
orator was expelled from the university; but he was munificently rewarded by the duke. Compare Barante: Histoire des duces de Bourgogne, 1824, tom. iv. pp. 108 sqq.

**JOHN THE PRESBYTER**, a half-mythical character of the twelfth century, whose fame aroused an intense curiosity, but whose very identity is a matter of uncertainty. The report spread through Europe, that, beyond Persia and Armenia, a powerful Christian was ruling, who had routed the Mohammedans in a great battle. He combined with his royal functions the consecration of a priest. Pope Alexander III. sent his physician, Philip, as legate, with letters addressed to John as the "King of the Indies, and most holy of priests" (Indorum regi, sacerdotum sanctissimo). A second epoch in the reports and fables concerning him begins in 1245, with the mission of the Franciscans and Dominicans for the evangelization of Eastern Asia. They carried instructions from Innocent IV. to search for the kingdom of the Presbyter John. Rubruquis, one of their number, reported that John was dead, but that "he had been a Nestorian, lived as a shepherd, and, after the death of Cerkhan, was made king." A third epoch in this legendary history begins with the account of Marco Polo, who reported the existence of a powerful Christian kingdom in Middle India which was named Abascia. The similarity of the names soon led to the inference that he referred to Abyssinia. The Catholic bishop, Jordanus of Quilon, in Southern India, called his king John. He was identified with the Presbyter; and this continued to be the universally received view of scholars till the seventeenth century. The present phase of the question is, that a certain King John did rule in Central Asia. The name had been corrupted from Jorkhan, which, in turn, was a corruption of Cirkhan. He was a Buddhist himself, but had Nestorians among his subjects. His daughter became a Christian, as did some of his Nestorians among his subjects. His daughter became a Christian, as did some of his Nestorians among his subjects. He was a man of very lovable disposition, of great modesty, industry, and kindliness. He issued, in connection with Rev. Samuel Johnson, A Book of Hymns (Boston, 1849); in 1868 The Worship of Jesus; and for many years before his death he had been at work upon a series, Oriental Religions, and their Relations to Universal Religion, of which India (Boston, 1872) and China (1877) have appeared. Although these two books are compilations, and not drawn from the sources, they have won a high place for their reliable and interesting contents, and appreciative spirit.

**JOK'TAN** was the son of Eber, the brother of Peleg, and father of thirteen sons (Gen. x. 25; 1 Chron. i. 19). According to the genealogical table of Genesis, the Shemitic race was, long before the emigration of the Abrahamites, divided into a northern branch (Peleg) and a southern (Joktan). The names of the thirteen sons of Joktan point towards Southern Arabia. Several of them have been identified with those of existing tribes, and the rest are probably identifiable in the same manner. The distinction which Genesis makes between the old Joktanite Arabs and the younger Ishmaelite Arabs is, indeed, an ethnographical fact well understood also by the Arabic ethnographers.
God of his foolishness by a gourd (iv.). Such are the contents of the book; and many have regarded it as an allegorical myth. The prevailing view at present among the representatives of modern criticism is, that it was a national prophetic tradition designed to serve a didactic aim, and with some elements of historic truth. The historical view appeals to the geographical and historical notices in the prophecy; as, for example, the evident accuracy of the description of Nineveh, the fitness of Jonah's mission at that particular period, when Israel was for the first time coming into contact with Assyria, etc. Those who deny the credibility make much of the miraculous story of the great fish; but this very incident is attested by our Lord's use of it (Matt. xii. 39, xvi. 4; Luke xi. 29). Hence, in the most emphatic manner, compares himself with Jonah, whose deglutition by the whale typified his burial. But Christ was greater than Jonah. The latter escaped only from the peril of death: the former overcame death. If this be the right interpretation of our Lord's words, then the miraculous preservation of Jonah gets its significance from the fact that it happened to him as a prophet. The central purport of the book is not that repentance was preached to the heathen, but that the prophet of God must do whatever the Lord commands, that not even death can frustrate his calling, and that the prophet must leave the fulfilment to God. Following the line of these three thoughts, the book details historical facts which were a prophecy of Him in whom the prophetic calling culminated. As for the prophet's prayer (ii. 3-10), we may say, with Luther, that in such a fearful contest with death.

It cannot be proved that the prophet left his work in its present form. The abruptness of the record leads us to suppose that it was originally one of a series of similar accounts. An old Haggadah calls Jonah a prophet of Elisha's school, and it is possible that it originated in one of these schools. Opinion has been divided about the date, some putting it as late as the period of the Maccabees. This view is entirely ruled out by the fact of its reception into the prophetical canon, and there can be no doubt that it was written before the Babylonian captivity. Jonah's tomb is still shown near the site of ancient Nineveh.

**JONAS, bishop of Orleans 821–844, played an important part in the controversy concerning image-worship. In his work De cultu imaginum he assumes a position intermediate between the rationalistic argumentation of the iconoclasts and the superstition of the multitude. His De institutione laici has considerable interest for the history of Christian ethics. The former work is found in Bibliotheca Maxima, xiv.; the latter, in D'Achery: Spicilegium, i., pp. 238 sqq.; Migone, CVI. Hagenbach.**

**JONAS, Justus, b. at Nordhausen, June 5, 1493; d. at Eisleben, Oct. 9, 1555; studied canon law at Erfurt, and took his degree, but devoted himself after 1519 to theology, led to do so by Luther's proceedings in 1517, and even his death. In 1521 he was appointed provost of Wittenberg, and became one of Luther's principal co-workers and one of his most intimate friends. In 1541 he removed to Halle: but in 1546 he was expelled from that place by Duke Maurice; and, though in 1548 he was allowed to return to preach, and left again. After participating in the foundation of the university of Jena, he was made court-preacher at Coburg in 1551, and pastor of Eisleben-on-the-Werra in 1553. His original writings are mostly polemical: De conjugio sacerdotali, 1523; Witz die rechte Kirch, etc., 1587. A great number of Luther's and Melanchthon's works he translated from Latin into German, and from German into Latin. His friendship with Luther is the most interesting fact concerning Jonas. He was one of the witnesses of Luther's marriage, carried on an intimate correspondence with him for twenty-five years, accompanied him on his last journey to Eisleben and stood at his bed-side, and, an hour later, wrote a particular account of his decease to the elector, and finally had the melancholy privilege of preaching the funeral sermon upon the great Reformer, both at Eisleben and Halle. Jonas was rather a fiery character, but enjoyed the fullest confidence of friends and foes. His letters, of great interest for the history of the Reformation, have been collected and edited by Gustav Kawerau, Halle, 1884–85, 2 parts, cf. Corp. Ref. His life was written by Reinhard, Weimar, 1731. Knapp (Halle, 1814), Hasse, in Meurer: Leben d. Alteater d. Luth. Kirche, 1864. Oswald Schmidt.

**JONCOURT, Pierre de, b. at Clermont in the middle of the seventeenth century; was appointed pastor of Middelbourg in 1678, and in 1686 at The Hague, where he died in 1701. In his work Discours sur les différentes méthodes d'expliquer l'Écriture (Amsterdam, 1707) he violently attacked the allegorical method, and happened to use some expressions about Cocceius, who had carried this method to its extreme limits, which the synod of Nineguen, 1708, compelled him to retract. He also published a revision of the translation of the Psalms by Clement Marot and Theodore Beza, Amsterdam, 1716.

**JONES, Jeremiah, b. in the north of England, about 1739; minister of a dissenting congregation at Forest Green, Gloucestershire, where he d. 1784. Author of A Full and A New Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament, London, 1726–27, 3 vols.; 3d ed., 1827.**

**JOPPA, sometimes called Japho (Josh. xix. 46), the present Yaffa, or Jaffa, is a very old city,
Jerusalem. Originally a Phoenician colony, it was allotted to the tribe of Dan (Josh. xix. 46); and under the reign of Solomon it became the port of Jerusalem (2 Chron. ii. 19). It started from there (Jon. i. 3). Several times taken and lost by the Maccabees, the city was a Roman possession in the time of the New Testament, when it was the scene of the raising of Tabitha to life by Peter (Acts ix. 36-43), and of Peter’s vision on the housetop (Acts x. 11). In the fifth and sixth centuries it was the seat of a bishop. In the period of the Crusades it was several times destroyed. At present it has eighteen thousand inhabitants, and a Greek, a Latin, and an Armenian convent.

JORDAN. (Hebrew, Yarden, from a root signifying “to descend”), called by the Arabs Esh-Sheriah, rises among the mountains of Anti-Lebanon, from four different sources; descends 1,494 feet, and forms the lake El-Huleh; descends again 897 feet in a course of nine miles, and enters the Sea of Galilee 682 feet below the Mediterranean; forms the “upper” and the “lower” plain; and finally empties itself into the Dead Sea, 1,292 feet below the Mediterranean, having descended 2,999 feet in a distance of 136 miles. It is mentioned a hundred and eighty times in the Old Testament, the first time in Gen. xiii. 10, where Lot beheld the plain of the Jordan as the garden of the Lord,—and fifteen times in the New Testament,—the first time in Matt. iii. 16, where John baptized the multitudes. As two rivers flow between the promontory of mount Gerizim and the plain of Esdraelon, the river Jordan must have been well known to the people. It was frequently crossed and recrossed; as, for instance, by Jacob (Gen. xxxii. 10), by the Israelites when entering the promised land (Josh. iii. 14), by Gideon pursuing Zebah and Zalmunna (Judg. viii. 4), by the Ammonites invading Judah (Judg. x. 9), by Abner (2 Sam. ii. 29), David (2 Sam. xvii. 22, xix. 15), Absalom (2 Sam. xvii. 24), Eleazar and Elisha (2 Kings ii. 6–14), etc. The Jordan is not, and never was, a navigable stream. It has, however, been crossed in a boat in modern times by Costigan (1835), Molyneaux (1847), Lynch (1848), and McGregor (1869). See article on Palestine.

JORIS, Johann David, one of the most curious characters among the Anabaptist fanatics of the period of the Reformation; was b. at Bruges, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, and educated at Delft, where he married in 1524, and settled as a merchant. Having become acquainted with the Reformation, he adopted its ideas; but the ostentatious and exulting manner in which he professed his faith caused him to be put in the pillory, and expelled from the city, with his tongue pierced by a red-hot iron. While roving about homeless, he fell in with the Anabaptists, was solemnly recognized as the anointed of the Lord, by one of their party, received visions and divine revelations, etc. After returning to Delft, he began to form an Anabaptist-Chiliast-Adamic sect, whose Messiah he was. The government tried in vain to stop this nuisance by catching the author. He always escaped, and sometimes in a manner so surprising, that people were led to believe that he could make himself invisible. One of the characteristics of the sect was the absolute confidence which the members put in the head. For this messiah they were willing to sacrifice every thing, even life. Many of them were burnt at the stake, after years in the dungeon. This confidence Joris used to gather a considerable fortune; and, with his family and his money, he removed, in 1544, to Basel, where he settled, under the name of Johann of Bruges, no one suspecting that the new, rich, and pious citizen had any thing to do with the notorious David Joris, whose pamphlets—peculiar mixtures of unintelligible mysticism and the coarsest sensuality, of which he published half a dozen every year—continued to cause grave disturbances. The truth oozed out, however, after his death (Aug. 23, 1556); and the magistrate of Basel instituted an investigation, after which his body, portrait, and books were burnt by the hangman, in the presence of an immense crowd, and all the survivors of his household were compelled to make public penance, June 6, 1556, in the cathedral. His sect did not outlive this century afterwards. See his Life, by Nippold, in Zeitschrift f. hist. Theologie, 1863, i., and 1864, iv. BERNHARD RIGGENBACH.


JOSCELIN, Bishop of Soissons 1126–52; sat among the judges of Abelard at the Council of Sena, and among those of Gilbert de la Porre at the Council of Paris. In 1131 he accompanied St. Bernard on his missionary journey to the court of Bordeaux. His Expositio Symboli and Expositio Orationis Dominice are found in Martene and Durand: Ampl. Coll., ix.

JOSEPH (50), “may he (God) increase!” was the eldest son of Jacob by Rachel, whom Jacob loved above all his other children. Stirred up by jealousy and hatred, his older brothers sold him, in his seventeenth year, to a caravan of merchants. He was taken to Egypt, where he acted as the faithful servant of a court official, but was falsely accused by his master’s wife, who had sought in vain to seduce him, and was thrown into prison. He secured his release by the happy use of the gift of interpreting dreams, and more especially the dream of Pharaoh (Gen. xii.). He was elevated to the most dignified position in the kingdom next to the throne, and developed a rare statesmanship in the measures he pursued, during the seven years of plenty, to prepare for the years of dearth. The famine of seven years was the occasion for Joseph’s brothers coming down to Egypt. Joseph recognized them, and ultimately gave them and his father Jacob a cordial reception. He received a double blessing at his father’s death, and extracted the promise from his brethren, that, at the return of the Israelites to Canaan, they would take his bones with them. The prom-
JOSEPH.

ise was kept, and the remains were buried at Shechem (Exod. xiii. 19; Josh. xxiv. 92).

Joseph's character justified Jacob's warm affection. He displayed throughout his entire life a profound fear of God and the marked influence of the divine Spirit. He won all hearts. As a statesman, he developed an exceedingly comprehensive, wise, and energetic activity, but always remained true to his own religious convictions. In his life divine providences are very prominent. God's wisdom used and overruled the base projects of men (Gen. 1. 20). Joseph's sale was the occasion of the transplantation of Israel to Egypt, the best administered state of the ancient world. God did not send them in vain to that school, where they adopted much of its better culture, and likewise suffered the enmity of the world, that they might be taught the saving deeds of Jehovah.

The references to Egyptian customs and manners are of great importance in their bearing upon the authenticity of the story of Joseph's life. There was a time when scholars (von Bohlen, Knobel, etc.) adduced many contradictions to Egyptian customs; but the researches of modern Egyptologists (Ebers, Brugsch, etc.) have confirmed in a remarkable manner the notices of Genesis. Commerce by caravans has been carried on between Syria and Palestine and Egypt from time immemorial; and the three spices mentioned in Gen. xxxvii. 25 have always been amongst the principal objects of commerce. The name Potiphar ("dedicated to Phra," or Ra, the god of the sun) is a real Egyptian name. Great stress was laid upon dreams in Egypt. The title "chief of the baker's" (Gen. xi. 2) has been found on monuments by Ebers. Wine, the use of which at this time in Egypt has been denied, has been proved to have been in use; and a baker carrying a board with loaves of bread on his head has been discovered on the monuments. Even the title "father to Pharaoh" (Gen. xlv. 8) has been found in several places on the rolls, in the sense of counsellor, or minister. These, and many other details, have been abundantly corroborated; and the impression cannot well be avoided which Ebers embodies in the following words: "The whole history of Joseph must be declared, even in its details, to correspond throughout with the real state of affairs in ancient Egypt."

The chronological question is more difficult of satisfactory solution. Did Joseph's administration occur under the Hyksos kings, or later? We hold to the former view; and taking four hundred and thirty years (Exod. xii. 40) as the period of bondage, and regarding Rameses II. as the Pharaoh of the oppression, we are led back to the Hyksos dynasty, and perhaps to King Apopi, whom G. Syncellus also identified with the Pharaoh of Joseph. Brugsch justly lays stress upon the fact that a famine occurred about the time of his reign. It is to the destruction of the monuments of the Hyksos kings by a later dynasty that the absence of all records of Joseph and his family is due. The Mohammedans linger with the story to the present day; and the Mohammedans, with peculiar delight over the story of Joseph's life, which Mohammed called the prettiest of all stories.

LIT. — The Histories of Israel of Ewald, Kertz [and Stanley, Lect. iv.]; Hengstenberg: Die Bücher Moses und Ägypten (1841); Ebers: Ägypten u. d. Bücher Moses, 1858; and the article in KIEM [and Smith].

JOSEPH II. (Roman emperor 1780-90) introduced into his hereditary Austrian possessions a series of ecclesiastical reforms, which, in many respects, remind one of those established in England by Henry VIII. Though touching the Church at very different points,—worship, inner organization, etc.—they all point in the same direction, and reveal a common tendency, which, in church history, has received the name of "Josephinism."

It was evidently the emperor's object to form a national Austrian Church, congruent with the territory of the State, closely connected with the strongly centralized, secular government, and as far as possible independent of Rome. As, on many points along the boundaries, Austrian dominions ranged under the authority of foreign bishops, a new circumscription of the dioceses was necessary; and it was carried out with very little ceremony. A new oath of subjection to the temporal ruler was demanded of the bishops. All imperial decrees were sent to the bishops, and again by them to the pastors, who had to make them known to their flocks from the pulpit. Papal bulls and briefs, on the contrary, whether referring to dogmatics or jurisdiction, could not be published in the country without an imperial placet. Petitions to Rome for indulgences, for the establishment of new festivals, etc., were absolutely forbidden; and all rights of absolution or dispensation were vested in the bishops. The oath of obedience to the Pope, and the profession fidei Tridentinae, usual at the distribution of degrees, were abrogated. The bulls In cana Dominii and Unigenitus were torn out of the books of liturgy. All relations were broken off between the religious orders and their brethren in foreign countries, or even their generals, unless resident in Austria. The theological students were forbidden to visit the Collegium Germanico-Hungarion in Rome, which institution was replaced by a Collegium Germanicum et Hungaricum in Pavia. The philological and theological schools in the monasteries were closed, and diocesan seminaries were opened under the superintendence of an imperial committee, etc.

No less comprehensive, and evincing the same character, were the reforms relating to the internal life of the Church. The Latin language was abolished, and the German introduced into the services. Pilgrimages outside of the country were forbidden. Rules were given with respect to the luxuriant ornamentation of the churches, the magnificent processions, the brilliant illuminations, etc. All religious orders not engaged in preaching, teaching, or nursing the sick, were dissolved. Between 1780 and 1786 the number of monasteries sank from 2,136 to 1,425, and that of monks and nuns from 64,890 to 44,280. An edict of Oct. 13, 1781, established religious toleration. The evangelical churches obtained a limited freedom of worship. Civil disqualifications arising from denominational differences were abolished. Even the position of the Jews was improved. The Roman curia became, of course, very alarmed at these proceedings; and in 1782 Pius VI. determined to go himself to Vienna, and pay the emperor a visit. But he was received
JOSEPH OF ARIMATHEA.

with cold politeness, and returned, after a month's stay, humiliated and in despair. The early death of the emperor, however, prevented his reforms from succeeding; and his successors much was again reversed. See the Biographies by Geissler, Halle, 1788; Muesel, Leipzig, 1790; Perzl, Vienna, 1790; F. X. Huber, Vienna, 1792; Cornova, Prague, 1801; Gross-Hoffinger, Stuttgart, 1855-57, 4 vols.; Heyne, Leipzig, 1844-53 vols.; Ramsden, Leipzig, 1801; Meynert, Vienna, 1832; [Rieth u. Reinhold: Kaiser Josef II. als Reform. auf kirchlich. Gebiete, Wien, 1881; G. Frank: Das Toleranz-Patent Kaiser Joseph II., Wien, 1882].

CARL MÜLLER.

JOSEPH OF ARIMATHEA, a rich and pious Jew, who acceded burial to the body of Jesus in a tomb of his own. He was probably a member of the Sanhedrin (Luke xxiii. 50), and refused his consent to the sentence of Jesus to death. His tomb is near Jerusalem, and under his name is a tomb of his own. He was robably a member of the Sanhedrin (Luke xxiii. 50), and refused his consent to the sentence of Jesus to death. The four evangelists (Matt. xvii. 57-60; Mark xv. 45-46; Luke xxi. 50-54; John xix. 38-42) refer to the part he took in the burial of Jesus. He asked the body of Pilate, and, in connection with Nicodemus, wound it in linen clothes, with spices, and deposited it in a rock-hewn tomb, in a garden, which had never been used. A wholly untrustworthy tradition makes him the apostle of England; and guides still show a thorn-bush at Glastonbury which purports to have sprung from a staff he stuck in the ground.

See Graal.

JOSEPHINISM. See Joseph II.

JOSEPHUS, Flavius, b. in Jerusalem 37 or 38 A.D.; belonged to a rich and distinguished family; received a careful education, and joined, after living three years with a hermit, Banus, the sect of the Pharisees, when he was nineteen years old. In 64 he made a journey to Rome in order to effect the release of some Jewish priests who had been imprisoned; and through the instrumentality of Aliturus, a Jewish actor, he obtained access to the Empress Poppea, and successfully fulfilled the mission. Shortly after his return to Palestine, the Jewish revolt against the Romans broke out (66). Like most of the wealthy men among the Jews, he was opposed to the revolt; but he was compelled to participate in it, and was chosen governor of Galilee. Besieged in the fortress of Jotapata by the army of Vespasian, he surrendered, after the lapse of a month and a half, and was taken prisoner; but when, two years later on (69), Vespasian was proclaimed emperor by the Syrian and Egyptian legions, he not only obtained his liberty, but accompanied the emperor to Alexandria, and received dotation and an annual pension. Living in Rome, he devoted himself to studies and literary pursuits, continuing to enjoy the imperial favor as long as the Flavian dynasty reigned. During the reign of Trajan he died, but the exact date of his death is not known. See Howel: Commentatio de F. J. vita, Traj.-ad-Rh., 1835; Terwogt: Het leven van den joodschen geschiedschrijver, F. J., Utrecht, 1883; Baerwald: Josephus in Galiläa, Breslau, 1877.

Josephus wrote in Greek. I. His first work, however, History of the Jewish War, was originally written in Latin. It was sent to Vespasian, Titus, Agrippa II., and other distinguished persons, and received many compliments. It is written with care; and, though it bears the marks of the taste of the time in its fictitious speeches and other rhetorical ornaments, it is generally trustworthy. Less careful is II., his Jewish Antiquities, finished in 93 or 94, and containing a history of the Jews from the beginning to 66. For the biblical part, the Bible is, of course, the principal authority of the author, though he does not hesitate to modify details which he fears might give offence. He also incorporates various elements of traditions, and extracts from earlier Greek treatments of Jewish history (Demetrius and Artapanus). Concerning his whole method of treating biblical history, and more especially his method of using the Septuagint and the original text, see Ernesti: Exercit. Flav., in Opusc. ; Spittler: De usu versionis Alexandrina apud Josephum, Göttingen, 1779; Scharfenberg: De Joseph et versionis Alexandrinae consensus, Leipzig, 1780; Burger: Essai sur l'usage que F. J. a fait des livres canoni ques de l'A. T., Strausburg, 1856; Gerlach: Die Weissagungen d. A. T. in den Schriften d. F. J., 1863; Duschk: J. F. und die Tradition, Vienna, 1864; Plaut: F. J. und die Bibel, Berlin, 1867; Tachauer: Das Verhältniss d. F. J. zur Bibel und zur Tradition, Erlangen, 1871. The post-biblical part is treated with great unevenness. The period between Alexander the Great and the Maccabees is nearly a blank, only filled out by a lengthy extract from Pseudo-Aristeus. For the history of the Maccabees the author had an excellent authority in the First Book of the Maccabees, but he has not taken great pains in utilizing it. The latter had written a work in which he represented the principal part of the narrative, and the representation of the inner history of the people has a rather legendary character. See Nussbaum: Observationes in Flavii Josephi Antiquitates, Göttingen, 1876; Bloch: Die Quellen d. F. J. in seiner Archdulogie, Leipzig, 1879. The eighteenth book of the work contains (3, 3) a short report of Christ, in which the author openly confesses that he believes in Jesus as the Messiah; but, though this famous testimony has been quoted by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. i. 11), it is evidently spurious. See Eichstaedt: Placiani testimoni authenticae, Jena, 1841; Question. super F., Jena, 1845; Gerlach: Die Weissagungen d. A. T. in den Schriften d. F. J., Berlin, 1863.

A curious work is III., his so-called Autobiography, written after the death of Agrippa II.; that is, after 100. It is not so much a biography as a plea for his activity in Galilee in the winter of 66-67, or a solennic against Justus of Tiberias. The latter had written a work in which he represented himself as the decided opponent of the rebellion, and Josephus as the true instigator of it. Of course, the former revolutionist, now living as a pensioner at the imperial court, could not let such an accusation pass by unnoticed. But Josephus seems to have become very much excited, and his book swarms with patent perverstions of facts. IV. Quite otherwise with his apology of Judaism, generally known under the title Contra Apionem. It is a careful and conscientious work. See the monographs by Zürcher (Vienna, 1871) and J. G. Müller (Basel,
in King James's version, is written in two places close of the wilderness period (Num. xxvii. 18; xxi. 40). It was at this time that Moses changed his name from Oshea ("help") to Joshua, which, as a work of Josephus; but it probably belongs to Hippolytus.


E. Schürer.

Joshua (yhw'ın', "God, his help"), a brave and God-fearing Hebrew warrior of the tribe of Ephraim, who led the armies of Israel across the Jordan, conquered the promised land, and distributed the territory among the tribes. He was neither a prophet nor law-giver, like Moses, but completed the work which he had begun, of turning a people of slaves into a nation with a country. The Lord appeared to him appropriately in the form of a soldier with drawn sword (Josh. v. 13). Joshua makes his first appearance in the battle of the Amaelites, when he routed the enemy (Exod. xvii. 9). We next find him in the twelve spies sent to spy out the land (Num. xiii. 8, 18). It was at this time that Moses changed his name from Oseah ("help") to Joshua, which, in King James's version, is written in two places Jesus (Acta vii. 45; Heb. iv. 8). He was consecrated by Moses as his successor just before the close of the wilderness period (Num. xxvii. 18; Deut. xxxiv. 9).

The second period of Joshua's career began at the death of the great law-giver, which marked the termination of the wanderings in the wilderness. With the freshness of spring life the people prepared, under their new leader, to fight for the possession of the land promised to Abraham. Joshua moved at first to have the cities inhabited by Canaanites, but assured of the divine command and aid (Josh. i 5, 9), displayed great energy in preparing for the campaign, and skill and intrepidity in prosecuting it. Circumspect and careful in his precautions, as in the despatch of the spies (Josh. ii, 1—9), he was no less bold in conception, and rapid in his movements (x. 9, xi. 7, etc.). The Canaanites were at this time in their most flourishing period (Ewald, ii. 340). The kings were bound together by treaties, the land protected by fortresses and walled towns, and the armies provided with horses and chariots. But Joshua was backed by a people enthusiastic to enter into the land which they regarded as their own, and who fully recognized their leader's authority (Josh. i. 16).

The Jordan being crossed, Joshua took up a position at Gilgal. From there he fell upon Jericho, after which, with the single exception of the repulse at Ai, he swept over the land in an unbroken succession of victories, spreading consterna tion among all the tribes (ii. 9, 24, etc.). The battle of Gibeon, or Beth-horon, was the decisive one. So great was the victory, that Jehovah is described as having fought on the side of Israel (x. 12—15); and, with poetic license, the Book of Jasher boldly represents the Almighty as halting the sun in its course over Gibeon, and the moon over Ajalon. The kings gathered for a last resistance at Merom (xii.), but were utterly routed.

During the war, which lasted five or six years, thirty-one kings had been slain, and six nations overthrown (xii. 24); and, if the land was by no means all subdued, enough had been conquered to insure to the Israelites safety of possession.

The third period of Joshua's career extends from the close of the war till his death. In the delicate work of distributing the territory among the tribes, he seems to have been no less discreet and successful than he had been brave and victorious on the battle-field. He acted in accord with Eleazar (xvii. 4, xxii. 1), and, with characteristic modesty, was himself content with a small portion (xix. 49, 50).

Like some modern soldiers, as Gustav Adolf, Cromwell, and Havelock, Joshua did not allow the confusion of the camp to interrupt the exercises of religion. He was a God-fearing commander, who made prayer and renewed consecration a preparation for battle and danger (iii. 5, etc.), regarded the observance of the law as a condition of divine favor (xxii. 6), and built altars in commemoration of the divine guidance and victories (iv. 6, 7, viii. 30, xviii. 1, etc.).

He was a devout hero, who combined mildness with strength, and composure with daring. His closing words to the congregation elders and people (xxii., xxiv.) contained no self-laudation, but directed their thoughts to the divine Helper, and urged them to cleave to Him, and keep the law (xxiii. 8). He died at the age of one hundred and ten. Joshua is a type of the greater Joshua (Jesus), the Captain of our salvation, who leads his people into the rest of the heavenly Canaan (Heb. iv. 8, 9).

No records exist for Joshua's life outside of the Bible, except one. Procopius, who flourished in the sixth century, relates that a Phoenician inscription existed in Tingis, Mauritania, with the words, "We are they who fled from the face of Joshua from the robber, the son of Nun." Rawlinson accepts the so-called Fourth Book of the Maccabees as ascribed to Josephus, but by a mistake. See the monograph by Frerichenthal, Breslau, 1869. Another book, אַיָּת הָעָלָה ("On the altar"), is quoted by Photius. John Philoponos, John Damascenus, and John Stobaeus, take Josephus as a work of Josephus; but it probably belongs to Hippolytus.

The dates of Joshua's life may be assigned to the sixth century, relating the Phoenician inscription existed in Tingis, Mauritania, with the words, "We are they who fled from the face of Joshua from the robber, the son of Nun." But Ewald regarded it as genuine (Bampton Lect., 91); but Ewald gives reasons for denying its genuineness in the second volume of his History.

The dates of Joshua's life may be assigned with comparative certainty. From Josh. xiv. 7—10 we learn that Caleb was forty at the time he was sent out as a spy, or three-and-thirty years after the departure from Egypt, and eighty-five when Hebron was assigned to him. As the wilderness period lasted forty years, he was seventy-eight or
the same age as Ahab, and regarding 1490 as the date of the exodus, then he crossed the Jordan (1450) at the age of seventy-eight, and concluded the war (1445) at the age of eighty-three. This would give five or six years for the duration of the war (chs. xxiii.1. See the Histories of Israel by Ewan), i.e., 1450) at the age of seventy-eight, and concluded the exaltation of King Jehoiachin at the court of Babylon, and which are put together in the Hebrew canon under the title Former Prophets. It fails naturally into three parts. 1 (purely historical). The history of the conquest of Israel (chs. i.–xii.). 2 (geographical and legislative). The partition of the country among the tribes (chs. xiii.–xxi.). 3 (historical). The dismission of the transjordanic tribes, Joshua's exhortation to the assembled tribes, their renewal of the covenant, deaths of Joshua and Eleazar (chs. xxii.–xxiv.). Joshua is by modern critics declared of composite origin, because the same peculiarity in the use of two names for the Divine Being (Jehovah and Elohim), which occurs in the Pentateuch, is found in it, and is considered to prove difference of authorship between the portions in which one or the other is uniformly used, and also the literary unity of Joshua with the Pentateuch, of which it is indeed a veritable and avowed continuation, or the existence of a Hexateuch, as the sixfold book is called. The writers were probably contemporaries, or else had access to contemporary documents; for the narrative is fresh and vivid, and the information throughout is that most likely to proceed from eye-witnesses. The very defects of the book in its geographical portion—e.g., no lists of the towns of Ephraim and Manasseh, imperfect lists for Zebulon and Asher—indicate the composition of these sections before the final settlement of the country, as the editors themselves considered it. The two dates at which events took place after Joshua's death, as the capture of Hebron by Caleb, of Debir by Othniel (xv. 13–20), and of Leshem by the Danites (xix. 47); such phrases as that the Jebusites dwelt with the children of Judah at Jerusalem (xx. 5), and the oft-repeated “unto this day” (e.g., iv. 9, v. 9); the mention of Rahab as still living when the author wrote (vi. 25); and other literary phenomena,—seem to show that the book, as a whole, is later than Joshua. That Joshua himself furnished materials for it is probable: indeed, he may have written large portions of it. Although our present book is a marked improvement of more than one hand in its materials, it has been unified and revised by some unknown editor; so that, as it comes before us to-day, it is a consistent narrative. The two difficulties often urged against the book, on the ground of scientific inaccuracies, are of little importance. The first relates to the ten stands of the twenty-five on Gibeon (x. 13). But this passage is avowedly poetical, and no such violent change in the universe as the supposed miracle would involve was dreamed of by the writer, who merely incorporated in his narrative a few lines from a justly celebrated historical poem. The second difficulty relates to the extermination of the Canaanites. It is sufficient to say, that the hopeless corruption of the Canaanites, and the religious interests of Israel and of humanity, demanded it. And as much of the later trouble of Israel came from their disobedience in stopping before the conquest was really concluded, and in allowing the idolatrous and licentious Canaanites to remain in any portion of the promised land, the wisdom of the divine command is manifest. “Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?” Besides, the Israelites under Joshua were hardy warriors, and carnage to their eyes was not shocking, and they rightly considered the Canaanites as foes to Jehovah, and unworthy to live. LIT.—Among modern commentators may be mentioned MAURER (Stuttgart, 1831), KEIL (Elangen, 1847; English translation, Edinburgh, 1883; abridged, Leipzig, 1863; 2d ed., 1874), KNOBEL (Leipzig, 1861), FAY (in LANGE, Bielefeld, 1870; English translation, New York, 1872); CROSBY (New York, 1875); G. A. McLEOD (Cambridge, 1878); COLENso: The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua (London, 1879); The Pulpit Commentary (London, 1881); J. J. Lias (Cambridge, 1882). See also MISS SMILEY: The Fullness of Blessing (New York, 1876), an allegorical commentary on Joshua, but very edifying and impressive. JOSHUA, Spurious Book of, a compilation made among the Samaritans, but not recognized by them. It relates the history of Joshua, with numerous departures from the Hebrew text, mere Samaritan fables, and continues the Jewish history down to Alexander Severus. The only manuscript copy of it in existence belonged to Joseph Scaliger, and is now in the Leyden Library. It was reprinted by T. G. J. JusBoll: Liber Eanap Chronicum Samaritanum, Lud. Batav. [Leyden], 1848. It is written in Arabic in Samaritan characters. Another reproduction of Joshua's history is the Samaritan Chronicle of Abul Phetach. See ABULFATHI Annales Samaritani, edited by Ed. Vilmar, Gotha, 1866 (with Latin translation). JOSIAH (whom Jehovah heals), king of Judah, son and successor of the murdered Amon; was put on the throne, at the age of eight years, by the people, who frustrated the designs of his father's murderers, and reigned thirty-one years (B.C. 641—609). The account of his reign is given in 2 Kings xxii.–xxiii. 30. 2 Chronicles. xxiv.–xxxv. Nothing is told us, however, about the early history of the king, nor of the influences under which he grew up. The narrative in Kings begins with his repair of the temple in the eighteenth year of his reign; and that in Chronicles, with the beginning of his destruction of idolatry in the twelfth. But that these acts were not the first evidences of his pious character, which made him one of the best of Judah's kings, is manifest from the high praise of 2 Kings xxii. 2, xxiii. 25. The great event in his reign occurred in his eighteenth year, referred to above. During the repairs, which apparently had been begun since Jehoiada's day (2 Kings xii. 11 sq.), the book of the law was found in the house of the
Lord by Hilkiah the priest. Hilkiah gave it to Shaphan the scribe, who read it before the king. (The "book" was probably Deuteronomy: if it was the whole Pentateuch, then it must have taken at least ten hours to read it through aloud.)

The king was so much terrified by the "book," that he rent his clothes, and immediately sent Shaphan and three others to Huldah the prophetess to learn the will of the Lord. She replied, that the Lord intended to punish the people for their long-continued disobedience, according to the warnings of the book; but, in consequence of Josiah's ready and sincere humiliation, the strokes were to be delayed until after his death.

The king gathered together all the elders of Judah and Jerusalem, the priests and the prophets, and all the people, and read to them the "book of the law," and with them entered into a solemn covenant to keep all its words. Then 2 Chron. xxxv. 7 sqq. seems to lay particular stress to this event, when Pharaoh-Necho, king of Egypt, and the army the following day. He was a kind and prudent man, but neither a great mind nor a perfectly pure character. A Christian himself, he immediately cancelled the laws of Julian against Christianity, revived the monogram of Christ on religion.

Shaphan the scribe, 10 read it before the king. The king was so much terrified by the "book," that he immediately cancelled the laws of Julian against Christianity, revived the monogram of Christ on religion. Even he may well have been little instructed in religion.

During his reign a nomadic horde of Scythians overran Asia (Herod., I. 104—106), of which no mention is made in the Bible, although we know they must have crossed near the lower portion of Judah. Jeremiah and Zephaniah were the prophets of Josiah's reign.

JOST, Isaac Marcus, b. at Bernburg, Feb. 22, 1793: d. at Francfort-on-the-Main, Nov. 20, 1860; was educated in a Jewish orphan-asylum at Wolfenbüttel; studied at Gottingen and Berlin; and was director of a Jewish school, first at Berlin, afterwards at Francfort-on-the-Main. He was a prolific writer; but his principal work is his Geschichte der Israeliten (1820—28, 9 vols.), of which a continuation, a tenth volume, appeared 1846—47.

JOVINIAN, Flavius Claudius, was commander of the imperial life-guard when Julian died (June 27, 363), and was proclaimed emperor by the army the following day. He was a kind and prudent man, but neither a great mind nor a perfectly pure character. A Christian himself, he immediately cancelled the laws of Julian against Christianity, revived the monogram of Christ on religion. Even he may well have been little instructed in religion.

During his reign a nomadic horde of Scythians overran Asia (Herod., I. 104—106), of which no mention is made in the Bible, although we know they must have crossed near the lower portion of Judah. Jeremiah and Zephaniah were the prophets of Josiah's reign. Even he may well have been little instructed in religion.

During his reign a nomadic horde of Scythians overran Asia (Herod., I. 104—106), of which no mention is made in the Bible, although we know they must have crossed near the lower portion of Judah. Jeremiah and Zephaniah were the prophets of Josiah's reign.

JOST, Isaac Marcus, b. at Bernburg, Feb. 22, 1793: d. at Francfort-on-the-Main, Nov. 20, 1860; was educated in a Jewish orphan-asylum at Wolfenbüttel; studied at Gottingen and Berlin; and was director of a Jewish school, first at Berlin, afterwards at Francfort-on-the-Main. He was a prolific writer; but his principal work is his Geschichte der Israeliten (1820—28, 9 vols.), of which a continuation, a tenth volume, appeared 1846—47.
barefoot, ate nothing but bread and water, and remained unmarried. He knew the Scriptures well, and wrote several pamphlets which attracted attention. His "heresy" consisted principally in the opposition, as well as in the spirit of the reigning. Between virginity, widowhood, and the married state, there is no moral difference, he said: between abstaining from food, and eating it properly, there is no difference. He especially protested against the establishment of a scale of virtue and a corresponding scale of blessedness, asserting that the divine element in human life is one and the same under all external circumstances; that all who are baptized to Christ, and born anew, have morally the same calling, the same dignity, the same grace, and the same blessedness. How deep an impression he made may be inferred from the fact, that in 300 Pope Sixtus found it necessary to convene a synod in Rome, and have him condemned. This decision was communicated to other bishops, more especially to Ambrosius of Milan, in whose diocese Jovinian and his adherents had sought refuge; and in 355 Ambrose convened a synod in Milan. Where the condemnation was repeated. Augustine wrote against Jovinian (Harres., 82; De Bono Conjugali; De Virginitate), especially against his denial of the perpetua virginitas Mariæ, and his doctrine of the equality of all sins. But it is more specially Jerome's Adversus Jovinianum which throws light on this whole subject, though it is written with so much acrimony that it cannot be used without great caution. By modern church-historians — Flavius, Basnage, Mosheim, Walch, Neander, Baur, and others — Jovinian has generally been recognized as a representative of the true principle of Protestantism. See G. B. Lindner: De Joviniano et Vigilantio, Leipzig, 1840. WAGENMANN.

JUBILEE. 1205

JUBILEE, or JUBILEE YEAR, one of the meanest institutions of the Roman-Catholic Church; has no connection whatever, either historically or typically, with the jubilee-year of the Old Testament. It originated incidentally. In the last days of 1299 a rumor sprang up in Rome that the instances of Zwingli, theology, and was appointed pastor of Einsiedeln in 1518, and of the Church of St. Peter in Zürich in 1522. He was an intimate friend of Zwingli, and his true and steady assistant in the carrying-out of the Reformation in Zürich. In literary respects he was mostly active as translator. Of the so-called Zürich Bible he did the Old Testament. He also translated the New Testament into Latin. His Life was written by C. Pestalozzi, Elberfeld, 1860. His was the German Bible used by Coverdale. See Westcott's History of the English Bible, pp. 213, 214.

JUDEA was the name given to the lowestmost of the three divisions of the Holy Land in the Saviour's time. It lay south of Samaria, and west of the Jordan. It was occupied, after the exile, by the captives from Assyria and Babylonia, but was made a portion of the Roman province of Syria A.D. 6, after Archelaus was deposed, and was ruled by a procurator under the governor of Syria, and whose residence was in Caesarea, not in Jerusalem. The word first occurs in Dan. v. 13 (A. V., "Jewry"); and the "province" of Judea is first mentioned in Ez. v. 8, and alluded to in Neh. xi. 3 (Hebrew and A. V., "Judah"). In the Apocrypha, Judea and "country of Judæa" frequently occur. In New-Testament times the term was loosely used to include the transjordanic provinces (Matt. xix. 1, etc.). The hill country of Judea (Luke i. 85) was the central ridge of mountains stretching from north to south through Palestine. The wilderness of Judea is a wild, desolate, uninhabited region, extending from the hill country, near Jerusalem, south-east to the Dead Sea, with an average width of fifteen miles (Matt. iii. 1). Here John preached, and our Lord was tempted.

JUDAH (praise; Greek form, Judas), a common name among the later Jews, particularly the Levites. Judah, the son of Jacob and Leah, although in age the fourth, virtually supplanted Reuben, the first-born, and enjoyed the respect of all his brothers by his energy of character. It was he who advised the selling of Joseph to Egypt (Gen. xxxvii. 26, 27), and who became surety for Benjamin (xliii. 9), and made that touching speech before Joseph (xlilv. 18-34). In the matter of Tamar (xxviii.), he does not appear in a favorable light; but even then his sense of justice and his inherent nobility came out. These traits characterized his descendants; and the prophecy of Jacob was fulfilled according to which the right
of primogeniture was given to him by his brethren, and he held the sceptre until Shiloh came (xlix. 8-12). v. orelli.

JUDAH, Kingdom of. See Israel.

JUDAH, Tribe of. See Tribes of Israel.

JUDAS, one of the twelve apostles, carefuuly distinguished by the evangelists from Judas Iscariot; called also Lebbaeus and Thaddaeus (Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 16; John xiv. 22; Acts i. 13.). His surnames Lebbaeus and Thaddaeus mean the same thing. The first comes from λέββας ("breast"); hence they mean beloved child. We know nothing about his history before or after his connection with Jesus. Tradition is also late and contradictory. According to Abdias he preached also to Phoenicia. Sieffert.

JUDAS ISCARIOT, one of the twelve disciples, and the betrayer of Jesus; was the son of a certain Simon. The name Iscariot, it is now generally, agreed, is a derivative of Kerioth, a town in the tribe of Judah (Josh. xv. 25). It was true that this was the native place of Judas, then he was the solitary Judeman among the disciples, who otherwise were from Galilee. The reference to the infamy, which, ever after his last in the list of the disciples, and probably points to the fact of his being selected Judas because he knew he would be tried him (Calvin, Hengstenberg, Plumptre, and others). It was probably at the edge of a precipice; and, falling headlong, as Peter adds, his body was broken asunder. Dr. Hackett discovered a spot which seemed to him to be the probable scene of this tragedy (Commentary on Acts, Notes on i. 18), and satisfied the details of both accounts. A ragged, weather-beaten, forlorn-looking tree near Jerusalem is called the Judas tree, and is pointed out to the traveller as the one from which the disciple committed suicide.

Two questions force themselves upon the attention in the study of the character of Judas: What was Christ's purpose in admitting him to the number of the twelve disciples? and what motives had Judas in betraying Christ?

1. The Admission of Judas to the Company of the Disciples. The difficulty of arriving at satisfactory results in the discussion of this question arises from theanthropic personality of Christ, and the meeting in him of a divine and human knowledge. Different theories have been urged to account for Christ's admission of Judas. (1) Christ made the choice with the prevision that Judas would betray him. He knew that he was a thoroughly depraved man. He selected Judas because he knew he would betray him (Calvin, Hengstenberg, Plumptre, and others), or in obedience to the divine will (Luther, Godet, etc.). If the words of John, "Jesus knew from the beginning . . . who it was that should betray him" (vi. 64), admit only of the interpretation that he knew it from the very first choice.
of the disciples, then this view is the only tenable one. (2) Jesus admitted Judas into the college of the disciples, recognizing his good qualities, and hoping to train him into a devoted follower, as he did Peter. He did not foresee his treason, just as he did not know the day of judgment. Judas was led by his Messianic hopes, and a certain admiration of Jesus, to join himself to his followers. Jesus gradually became familiar with the inveterate depravity of his nature, as it expressed itself in hypocrisy, an inordinate love of money, etc. This is the view of Neander, Lange, Ebrard, Weiss (Com. on John, Note on chap. vi.), and others. In Christ’s presence, men became either better or worse. Judas might have become better; but in reality he became worse.

II. MOTIVES OF THE BETRAYAL. —The treachery of Judas stands out in the sharpest contrast to the goodness of Christ. It perhaps represents the culmination of human ingratitude, as the cross represents the culmination of divine love. Luke and John both ascribe Judas’ deed to treachery, and Satan (Luke xxii. 3; John xiii. 2, 27). The evangelists do not give us an exhaustive analysis of the motives of his deed. (1) The immediate motive advanced by them was avarice. Thirty pieces of silver was not much, but great crimes have been committed for sums more paltry. There were, no doubt, other motives mixed up with this. A grave crime is often the resultant of many motives. (2) He desired to save himself. He felt that Christ could not go on much longer as he had been going. The bitter enmity of the Jews would inevitably burst upon him, and the disciples might share the destructive consequences of the storm. Motives of self-interest led him to secure himself with the chief priests. (3) He was actuated by malice. His character threw a shadow across the pathway of Christ. He recognized the purity of the Master, and in the presence of it he felt himself condemned. He shrank from that pure and benevolent eye. Such words as “Ye are clean, but not all,” the commendation of Mary (John xii.), and the reproof of miserliness, festered in his bosom. Vice, as it does in, his case became vindictive, and, in the hope of excusing itself, struck at virtue. Other motives have been assigned for Judas’ action. (1) He betrayed Christ from motives of patriotism. (2) He was carrying out a subtle plan by which he expected to force Christ to manifest his Messianic power, and realize the triumph of the Messianic kingdom. This, the view of Archbishop Whately, supposes that Judas had confidence in Christ, and believed he would not suffer himself to be put to death. Both these views are at variance with the accounts in the Gospels.

The crime of Judas some have attempted to extenuate on the ground that it was the execution of a divine and irresistible purpose to bring about Christ’s death, which was necessary to the salvation of the race. The Perate and Cainites, two Gnostic sects of the second century, went so far as to represent him as the true apostle, whose deed liberated Christ from the bondage of mortality. All of these views are erroneous. God’s trend of grace is shown in the words of Christ, “Woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! It had been good for that man if he had not been born” (Matt. xxvi. 24). Dante places Judas, together with Brutus and Cassius, in the lowest apartment of hell. The last words of Judas, “I have sinned in that I betrayed innocent blood” (Matt. xxvi. 4), were not words of repentance, but of remorse and despair. They were uttered in the spirit of Macbeth after he had murdered Duncan,—

"I am afraid to think what I have done. Look not again, I dare not."

Peter’s denial differed from Judas’ crime by being a sin of “sudden lapse.” Judas was deliberate in his planning, and malevolent in his intent.

LIT. — ZANDT: Comment. de Juda proditore, Lips., 1769; DAUB: Judas Ischarioth, Heidelberg, 1816–18; the Commentaries on Matthew and John, and an excellent article in Smith’s Bible Dictionary by Dean Plumptre, and the addition in the American edition by Professor Edwards A. PARK.

D. S. SCHAPF.

JUDAS MACCABÆUS. See MACCABEE.

JUDE, The Epistle of, one of the seven Catholic Epistles of the New Testament, was written by “Jude, a servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James” (ver. 1). The author does not call himself an apostle, nor does any thing in the Epistle indicate that he was known by that title. It contains references and warnings to those that had given themselves up to formation (ver. 3), and were walking after their own lusts (ver. 18), but they were not simply practical libertine (De Wette), but combined with their moral laxness errors of doctrine. They were, in fact, false teachers (Dorner, Doctr. of the Person of Christ, i. p. 104), as is evident from verse 4, which speaks of “certain men who had crept in unawares, having perverted the teaching of the “common salvation” (ver. 3). These teachers were still in communion with the Church (ver. 12); but their doctrines tended
to derogate from the honor of Christ. They engaged in dreamy speculations (ver. 8), and from them proceeded their impious conduct, and the depreciation of Christ and the angels. These teachers, however, are not to be identified with the Gnostics of the second century. The descriptions in the Epistle are too general in their character to warrant this view. Nevertheless, the false teaching described in the Epistle of Jude belongs to the germ-period of Gnosticism. Hegesippus (Euseb., H.E., IV. 22) was not without authority for saying that, after the death of James, difficulties manifested themselves in the Church, which he associates very closely with the Gnosticism of a later period. The(errorist of Jude resemble the Nicolaitans of the Apocalypse; and Thieresch, Ewald, and Huther find the resemblance so strong as to regard their errors as a later form of the Nicolaitan heresy. Whether these tendencies were really prevalent over the whole Christian Church, or not, Judas writes as though they were, and exhorts the believers to hold fast to the teaching of the Apostles (vers. 3, 17).

The date at which Jude wrote his Epistle cannot be determined with definiteness from the use it made of other writings, and the use they made of it. The Book of Enoch is not only referred to in verse 6, but is also quoted (ver. 14 sqq.). This work in its original form was certainly written in the time of the early Maccabean princes (Lücke, Ewald, Dillmann, Hilgenfeld, Langen), and probably in the reign of Jonathan (Sieffert, De Apocryphi libri Henochi origin e et argumento, 1867). The Assumptio Moris, which seems to be referred to in verse 9, was probably written before 44 A.D. Jude also betrays a knowledge of Paul’s writings. The Second Epistle of Peter, on the other hand, shows an acquaintance with Jude (Guericke, Wiesinger, Bleek, Weiss, etc.). We have, however, no right to conclude, because the destruction of Jerusalem is not mentioned among the examples (cf. ver. 5 sqq.), that that event had not already occurred before the Epistle was written. There was no good reason for Jude to have mentioned it. The fact that he, the brother of James, feels himself called upon to warn against the false teachers, indicates that he wrote after that brother’s death (69 A.D.). The date of composition may therefore be pretty confidently set down between 70 and 80 after Christ.

The genuineness of the Epistle has been called in question by Luther, Grotius, Semler, the Tubingen school, etc. It is true that the testimonies of antiquity in regard to it are vacillating. The Muratorian Canon mentions it, but denies that Jude was the author. Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria are acquainted with it, and so likewise Origen, who, however, mentions doubts about its genuineness. The Peshito did not originally contain it, and Eusebius placed it among the Antilegomena. Jerome, through whose influence it came to be generally accepted, says that it was rejected by the majority on account of its apocryphal quotation. These testimonies unfavorable to the genuineness are to be explained by the fact that the author was not an apostle, and that he quoted from the apocryphal Book of Enoch, but are not a sufficient argument against it.

(3) The third characteristic was the change in the divine revelations (cf. 1 Sam. iii. 1). In the beginning, God dealt personally with men, then through angels, then through prophets, until finally even these ceased after Malachi. The period of the judges marks the transition from the second to the third species of divine revelations. The angel of the Lord appeared at the beginning of the period like a living word (Judg. ii. 1-3); but, besides the passing allusion in Deborah's song, only two important actions are done or announced by angels,—the call of Gideon (vi. 11 sqq.) and the birth of Samson (xiii. 3). In 1 Sam. no angel is mentioned; in 2 Sam., only one (xxiv. 16 sqq.). In the days of the judges, on the other hand, the prophetic office was developed. Deborah was a prophetess (Judg. iv. 4); two unnamed prophets are spoken of (vi. 8; 1 Sam. ii. 27 sqq.); and at the close of the period appears Samuel, a prophet in the full sense of the word. In the schools of the prophets, or, more correctly, unions of prophets, were established (1 Sam. x. 5, 10).

In general, the period of the judges was both a close and a beginning. It closed the nomadic, unsettled life of the wandering and the conquest; it prepared the way for the orderly and regulated life of the monarchy. In Egypt, Israel had become a people without a country; in the period of the judges the people took root in the territory God gave them. It was a time of personal heroism; but these heroes of Israel are not to be confounded with the heroes of mythology, as some would do. It was a time of noble words, as well as deeds. Deborah's ode is a masterpiece, and a model for all time; Jotham's fable (Judg. ix. 7 sqq.) equals any, although it is the oldest of all; the speeches of Gideon and Jephthah are fine specimens of rugged eloquence; and, finally, Samuel was a teacher sent from God, faithful, fearless, fertile, from whose lips dropped pearls of wisdom. It was the time of the strongest theocracy in form, but the weakest in power; for only while the accepted representative of Jehovah, the judge, lived, did the people worship Jehovah.

The name Judge (יְדֵעַ) implies chiefly, but not only, judicial activity in the strict sense. Some of them, e.g., Samuel, were probably not judges at all; but, on the other hand, others were, e.g., Deborah (Judg. iv. 5), Samuel (1 Sam. vii. 15-17), and his sons (viii. 1-3). Again: the "judge" was not hereditary ruler, not king (hence Abimelech, who, on the strength of his father's [Gideon's] authority, claimed kingship, cannot be reckoned among the Judges); but he was divinely appointed ruler, and had the piety of the people in charge. But the "judge" was always the savior of his country.


The chronology of the period is confused. If the successive dates are added, the result is four hundred and ten years from Othniel to Samson. To this add the forty years of Eli's administration, and there result the four hundred and fifty years of Paul's statement (Acts xiii. 20). But that this sum is too large is proved by Jephthah's statement, that from the conquest to his day was three hundred years (Judg. xii. 6), and by the statement in 1 Kings vi. 1,—that from the exodus to the fourth year of Solomon's reign was four hundred and eighty years. The simplest explanation of this manifest discrepancy is that several of the judges were contemporaries. Proof of the supposition is derived from the juxtaposition of Shamgar and Ehud (Judg. iii. 31, iv. 1), without statement of the length of Shamgar's judgeship, both coming in the eighty years of iii. 30; and from x. 7, which recounts a simultaneous opposition by Philistines and Ammonites. We may therefore consider the period divided into six forty years: i.e., from Othniel to Samson were two hundred and forty years, which harmonizes with Judg. vi. 6, 1 Kings vi. 1. The other numbers are then parallel numbers. [Balderweg: Das Zeitalter der Richter, Zittau, 1877.]

JUDGES, Book of. The book falls into three divisions. 1st, Chaps. i. 1-iii. 8. In regard to this division, three queries have been raised,—whether it should embrace more or less matter; whether the events of chap. i. are contemporary with, or earlier than, those of ii.—iii. 6; and whether chap. i. is written by the author of the greater part of the book. In answer, we state that the division should be considered introductory to the book, even if i. 1—ii. 5, and ii. 5—iii. 6, are derived from different sources; for the whole Book of Judges treats of the alternation of infidelity and punishment, repentance and delivery. Of this history, ii. 11—iii. 6 is a summary of i. 1—ii. 5, in turn, an introduction to the summary, setting before us the obedience or disobedience of the respective tribes to the divine command to drive out the Canaanites, upon which the subsequent fate of Israel depended. In this struggle with Canaan, Judah and Simeon were particularly faithful; and to Judah was given the leadership (i. 2), although, later on, Ephraim, not so faithful in extermination (i. 20), seems to have obtained it. This entire first section joins directly on to the Book of Joshua, and shows how badly Israel fulfilled the task plainly set before them at Joshua's death,—so badly, that when the Ammonites rebuked them severely, and prophesied that the remaining Canaanites should be adversaries, and their gods a snare (ii. 1—5). The author explains the failure, in part, on the idea that the generation which arose after Joshua, and the elders that outlived him, "knew not the Lord, nor the works which he had done for Israel" (ii. 10). In order to set forth this point clearly, the author recurs again to the last official act of Joshua recorded in Josh. xxiv. 28, and retells the succes
sive deaths of the fathers, and then summarizes the history of the period of the judges. Chaps. ii.-viii. contains these two ground thoughts of the book, gives a list of the nations left to prove Israel, and adds the new ideas that these nations taught the Israelites how to war (iii. 2), and that they lived peaceably together, even to the extent of intermarriage. JUDGMENT. JUDGMENT.

This division, the main part of the book, contains the six great periods of the history, with their subdivisions: (1) Othniel (iii. 7-11); (2) Ehud (iii. 12-30), with allusion to Shamgar (iii. 31), a contemporary judge; (3) Deborah and Barak (iv. and v.); (4) Gideon (v. 1-xviii. 30), with the history of Abimelech (ix.), and allusion to Tola and Jair (x. 1-5), contemporary judges; (5) Jephthah (x. 6-xii. 7), and allusion to Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon (xii. 8-15), contemporary judges; (6) Samson (xiii-xvi.).

3d, Chaps. xvii.-xix. The third division contains the history of Israel in the Bashan. The book of gods (xvii.-xviii.); and a tribal history, — the destruction of Benjamin (xix.-xxi.). That these two histories were put at the end of the book is proof that the author had a plan for his work. They throw a flood of light upon the moral and religious condition of the people, and thus serve his purpose, and are a vital part of the book. The stories fall in the earlier part of the period: in proof cf. xviii. 1 with i. 34; and, for the second, cf. xx. 27 sq. with Josh. xxii. 13, xxxiv. 33.

The Book of Judges is of single authorship, although the materials may have been derived from various sources. The only note of time of composition is given in xviii. 30. "Jonathan . . . and his sons were priests to the tribe of Dan until the day of the captivity of the land." This doubtless refers to the Assyrian captivity, either under Tiglath-pileser (2 Kings xv. 29), 722 B.C., or Sargon (2 Kings xvii. 6), B.C. 721; and therefore the book was written after that occurred.

Lit. — Modern commentaries are by STUDEER (Bern, 1835; 3d (title) ed., 1842); BENTHEAU (1845); Kuen (1845); KIRK (English translation, Edinburgh, 1865); CASSIL, IN LANOE (English translation, New York, 1872); HERVEY, in Speaker's Commentary (New York, 1875); DOUGLAS (Edinburgh, 1881); cf. WELLHAUSEN-BLEEK (Einleitung, Berlin, 1878), and WELLHAUSEN (Geschichte, v. vii.). See also BALDEWD: Das Zeitalter d. Richter, Zittau, 1877.

JUDGMENT. The Divine. The word "judgment" is in the Bible used in three senses: 1st, Pictorially as the place of judgment, inclusive, however, of the act (Ps. 1. 5, cxix. 84, cxlii. 2; Ezek. xii. 10, etc.); 2d, the criminal, including children of God, as in the verse of the 2d Commandment (Mark iii. 29; John v. 29; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude 16); 3d, The single act of judgment upon individuals or nations, particularly punishments (Ps. x. 5, cxix. 79). Such judgments as are executed upon earth through miracles, or in the ordinary course of God's providences, are only relative, and look forward to a future absolutely right and absolutely complete divine judgment which is appointed to every soul after death (Eccl. x. 9; Heb. ix. 27), and to the whole race at some future definitely fixed time called "the judgment day of Jehovah," or "the day of judgment" (2 Pet. ii. 9, iii. 7; 1 John iv. 17; cf. Rev. xiv. 7). So the prophets declare. This Joel, after describing the plague of locusts which God sent, goes on to speak of the judgment which was to come upon all nations (iii. 1 sqq.); and so Amos (v. 18 sqq.); and from that time Isaiah speaks of the exile as an imminent judgment upon Israel (iii. 14), after which there would be a deliverance through the Messiah, and finally came to judge all those who had not accepted the Messiah (xxxiv. 1 sqq., lxvi. 16 sqq.; Dan. vii. 22 sqq.).

Thus it is shown that the idea of a world's judgment was familiar to the Old Testament; but its aim was not to show how man's deeds reward every man according to his work, but rather to display his love towards those who accept his grace. Since man can refuse this grace, God would separate the sinners from the righteous, and thus render it possible to have his will done on earth as in heaven. The motive to this operation is simply the saving and perfection of the Church upon the earth.

The doctrine of the divine judgment is completed in the New Testament. That it is by no means in its idea a manifestation of abstract distributive justice is proved by the person chosen to be the judge, who is none other than the Son (John v. 22), and who judges, as the Son of man, the head and redeemer of his Church, and for his Church's sake. He judges his Church, in the first place, in order that it may be holy, calling upon it to suffer persecution and trial so that its virtues may increase. But when the world threatens to destroy his Church, then he comes to avenge her (Luke xviii. 7, xxii. 22; Rev. vi. 10, xix. 2). Hence it follows that the persons who are to be judged on the last day are those who do not belong to Christ's Church, those who are his living or dead enemies (John v. 24). Those who have fallen asleep in Christ live with him in heaven (1 Thess. v. 10), and are awakened in the first resurrection (Rev. xx. 1 sqq.), and are in heaven in the second resurrection, i.e., to judgment, active participants (Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 30; cf. 1 Cor. vi. 2, 15; Eph. v. 5; 2 Cor. v. 10; Rom. iv. 10) does not contradict this view; for he is speaking of a manifestation of the works of the body, not of a judgment of the doers. The Old-Testament saints, also, although they had tenanted Sheol with the unbelievers (e.g., Samuel with Saul, 1 Sam. xxvi. 9, cf. xxv. 9 sqq.), are not the objects of the judgment; for they have been delivered from Sheol by Christ, and are now in heaven (Matt. xxvii. 57; cf. John viii. 50).
up her dead (xx. 12). All descendants of the first Adam who have not been regenerated, consequently all heathens, all merely nominal Christians, and all unbelieving Jews, will all be judged according to their works (Matt. xvi. 27, xvii. 31 sqq.; Rom. ii. 6-8; Rev. xx. 12 sqq., xxii. 12). And herein lies a great hope. The judgment is not abstract distributive justice, but the completion of his Church. The question he asks is, therefore, Who has shown himself by his works savable? who by patience in well doing has sought for glory and honor and incorruption? (Acts x. 35; Rom. ii. 7.) And those who stand this test, though they never heard the gospel preached, shall be saved through the blood of the Lamb, and to these sick souls the leaves of the tree of life will bring health (Rev. xxiii. 2). But those who cannot stand this test are forever lost.

JUDITH. JUDSON.

JUDSON, Adoniram, the Apostle of Burmah, and one of the first and most devoted of the foreign missionaries of the American churches; b. Aug. 9, 1788, at Malden, Mass.; d. on board of a vessel off the coast of Burmah, April 12, 1822. His father was the pastor of the Congregational Church at Malden at the time of his birth. He graduated first in his class, at Brown University, in 1807. He then taught school for a year at Plymouth, during which time he published Elements of English Grammar and The Young Ladies' Arithmetic (both, Boston). In the fall of 1808 he entered Andover Seminary, although "not a professor of religion, or a candidate for the ministry, but as a person deeply in earnest on the subject, and desirous of arriving at the truth" (Wayland). The following May he made a profession of his faith in the Third Congregational Church at Plymouth, of which his father was then pastor.

Mr. Judson's attention was first drawn to the subject of missionary effort in heathen lands by the perusal, in 1809, of Buchanan's Star in the East; and in February, 1810, he finally devoted himself to that work. About this time he entered into intimate relations with that illustrious first Adam who have not been regenerated. All descendants of the India; and, after various vicissitudes, he landed for a visit to his natal land. On the voyage his second wife died (Sept. 1) at St. Helena. She was the widow of the missionary, Dr. Boardman, and had been married on Feb. 5, 1812. She entered with great enthusiasm into missionary effort, and established a school at Rangoon for girls. In 1821 she paid a visit to America. Her health was never robust; but she combined with strong intellectual powers a remarkable heroism and fortitude. During the imprisonment of her husband she was unremitting in her self-sacrifice, and walked fearless and respected from palace to prison among the excited Burman population.

In 1830 Mr. Judson began preaching to the Karens. In 1835 he completed the revision of the Old Testament in the Burmese language, and in 1837 that of the New Testament. In the latter year there were 1,144 baptized converts in Burmah. After an absence of more than twenty years, the now worn missionary returned, in 1845, for a visit to his native land. On the voyage his wife died (Sept. 1) at St. Helena. She was the widow of the missionary, Dr. Boardman, and was married to Mr. Judson in 1834. Mr. Judson's arrival in the United States was the signal for an enthusiastic outburst of admiration for the missionary, and interest in the cause he represented. Everywhere crowded assemblies gathered to see and hear him. He, however, shunned the public gaze, and was diffident as a speaker. As early as 1833 Brown University had honored him with the degree of D.D. On Jan. 1, 1844, he again set sail for Burmah, having married, a few days before, Miss Emily Chubbuck of Eaton, N.Y., who afterwards wrote under the name of "Fanny Forster." He arrived safely at Rangoon, having married, a few days before, Miss Emily Chubbuck of Eaton, N.Y., who afterwards wrote under the name of "Fanny Forster." He arrived safely at Rangoon, and spent much of the remaining period of his life in editing a dictionary of the Burmese language. His health, however, was shattered; and he died while on a voyage to the Isle of Bourbon, in its interests. His body was buried in the ocean.

Mr. Judson was a man of medium height and slender person. He was endowed with strong...
JUGGERNAUT.
JULIAN.

intellectual powers, and sought in his Christian life, by the perusal of the works of Mme. Guyon and others, a fervent type of piety. His confidence in the success of missionary effort was peculiarly strong. Being asked, on his visit to America, whether the prospects were bright for the conversion of the world, he immediately replied, "As bright, Sir, as the promises of God." Adoniram Judson was one of the most heroic and devoted, as well as one of the earliest, missionaries which America sent forth to heathen lands. His name will ever continue to shine amongst the galaxy of apostolic laborers. He has merited, and will ever continue to be known by the proud title of the Apostle of Burmah. See J. D. KNOWLES: Life of Mrs. Ann H. Judson, 3d ed., Boston, 1829; STUART: Lives of Mrs. Ann H. and Sarah B. Judson, with a Biographical Sketch of Mrs. Emily C. Judson, 1853; FRANCIS WAYLAND: Life and Labor of 251. 363; b. b. 363; was a son of Constantius, the younger half-brother of Constantine the Great. When Constantine's sons succeeded their father (in 337), Constantius was put to death, and Julian and his older half-brother were spared only because they were considered harmless. Julian was educated in the Christian faith. Eusebius of Nicomedia was his tutor; and when (in 350) he was recalled from Macellum to Constantinople, were Christians of the same description: hence the explanation of his so-called apostasy. In 351 he was again banished from Constantinople. While sojourning in Nicomedia, Pergamum, and Ephesus, he became acquainted, through Libanius and Maximus, with the highest form of Pagan civilization,—Neo-Platonism; and on the instance of Maximus he formally abandoned Christianity, and embraced Paganism. But his cousin, the emperor, was a fanatic adversary of Paganism. He had closed the temples, for 'On his way to the East, the emperor's sister Helena, and appointed governor of Gaul. In this position he developed an unsuspected military and administrative ability; and when (in 360) the emperor ordered the best part of the army of Gaul to the East, the soldiers refused, and proclaimed Julian Augustus. He managed this delicate affair with great tact. He asked the emperor to sanction what had taken place, and then when the emperor threateningly refused to do so did he march towards the East at the head of the whole army. On the frontier of Thracia the news of the emperor's death reached him (October, 361), and in December he entered Constantinople sole ruler of the Roman Empire. In March, 363, he departed from Antioch, where he had resided for nearly a year, and entered upon the campaign against the Persians. The first encounters with the enemy were successful; but on June 26, 363, while marching in the midst of the battle, without armor, he was deadlly wounded by a spear,—Persian or Roman, Pagan or Christian, nobody knows. Of his last hours, legend gives us very different reports. The most widely known, because of its glittering dramatical point, is that contained in Eusebius's Hist. Eccl., iii. 25, according to which he cried out, while in the agonies of death, "Thou hast conquered, Galilean." The most conspicuous feature of the short reign of Julian is his attempt at restoring Paganism. As soon as he was proclaimed Augustus, he threw off the mask. On his way to the East he re-opened the temples, which had been closed. On entering Constantinople, he dismissed the Christian officers from the palace, the Praetorian guard, and the administration. The cross was removed from the military standards, the court-room, the imperial statue, etc., and Pagan emblems were substituted. A decree ordering the decaying temples to be put in repair, all destroyed ones to be rebuilt at the cost of the destructors. Confiscated temple estates or temple treasures should be restored by the despoilers. Paganism should once more be made the religion of the State, and enjoy all the preferences and privileges of a State.
It must be noticed, however, that the restoration thus attempted was not simply a reaction against Christianity, but much more—a fundamental reform of Paganism itself. It was not the old, naive, popular worship which Julian wished to revive; it was a new, subtle, theological system, based on the philosophy of the Neo-Platonists, which he wanted to establish. All the practical lines of his plans run back to the mysteries as the model. The Paganism which Julian labored to restore was the mystery transformed from an esoteric science into a popular education, from an exclusive institution to a general social function. The return to Paganism was to be made dependent upon a kind of inauguration, with peculiar ceremonials. A priesthood was to be created, not only hierarchically organized, with the emperor at the head as pontifex maximus, but also socially distinguished from the mass of the people. A priest should be a man of philosophy and asceticism, shunning the inns and the theaters, and occupied in prayers and caring for the poor for Julian was not afraid of borrowing from Christianity itself. Charity is a specifically Christian virtue, entirely unknown to antique civilization; and Julian admired the relations which Christianity had created between rich and poor. He consequently wanted to engrave the new principle on his restored Paganism; but this character of his work—it being a reform, rather than a restoration, of Paganism—explains the singular coldness with which it was met by the Pagans themselves. While residing in Antioch, he must have noticed many indications, not only of lack of sympathy with his plans, but of direct aversion to them; and he must have received some impression from them, coming as they did from those among his subjects to whom he wanted to appear as a liberator.

The question, what Julian finally meant to do with Christianity, is not easy to answer. He despised it, perhaps he hated it; at all events his hand fell heavy upon it. Not only were the Christians excluded from all public offices, but the Church lost all its privileges. It was bereft of the support from the State, and in some cases even of that from the people itself. The Church received in earlier times. It lost its right of jurisdiction, of legalizing wills, of receiving donations, etc. The clergy was again made subject to taxation and conscription. The hardest blow, however, was the school law of June 17, 392. It ordered that all candidates for positions as teachers should obtain the confirmation of the secular authorities, that is, indirectly from the emperor himself; and such a law could not fail, in the course of time, practically to exclude the Christians from the schools and from all higher education. With respect to the internal affairs of the Church the emperor refrained altogether from interfering with them. He treated all parties in the same manner. Immediately after his accession he allowed the orthodox bishops, who had been exiled by the Arian Constantius, to return, and gave them back their confiscated property. But it is more to the point to speak of the dissatisfaction at the internal dissensions which tore the Church. Actual persecutions he did not institute, but he connived at injustice and violence. While riots began to take place in the provinces, and mobs to fall upon the Christians, the emperor remained silent and passive; and in some cases he openly applauded government officials, though they had actually overstepped their instructions in their chicaneries against the Christians.

Before he left for the Persian war, a rumor sprang up, that, on his return, he had decided to change his policy of indifference with respect to Christianity, and open a direct attack on the Church. This rumor is often referred to by contemporary Christian writers, and specially spoken of by Ephraem Syrus in his four poems against Julian (written in 363; edited by Overbeck, Oxford, 1865). It is probably not altogether fictitious, but its substance is not recognizable any more. Julian's Epistle to Basilus, dated some days before he went away to the camp, and containing open threats, is, no doubt, spurious.

LIT.—The principal source for the life of Julian is, of course, found in his own works, edited by C. Hertlein, Leipzig, 1876-76, two volumes, and containing eight orations, an address to Themistius, and another to the Athenians, a Symposium held in Olympia by the deceased emperors, Misopogon, "the beard-hater," a satire, and eighty-three Letters. Of his work against the Christians, only fragments have come down to us. Among pagan writers, Ammianus Marcellinus, Eutropius, Zosimus, are the most important; among Christian writers, Gregory Nazianzen, Ephraem Syrus, Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomenus, and Theodoret. Of modern treatments of the subject we mention those by Neander, Berlin, 1812; Teuffel, Tubingen, 1844; Straus: Der Romaniker auf dem Thron der Caesaren, Mannheim, 1847; Rode, Jena, 1877; [Naville, Neuchatel, 1877; Kellerauer, Leipzig, 1877]; Alfonso (Russian), Kazan, 1877; Torquati (Italian), Rome, 1878; Kendall, London, 1879. [See also Juliani imperatoris librorum contra Christianos qua superavit, edited by Neumann, and the German translation by the same, Kaiser Julians Bcker gegen die Christen, both Leip., 1880; Joh. G. E. Hoffmann: Julianos der Abrlininge, Syrische Erzahlungen, Leiden, 1880; Ragey: La persc. de Julien l'Apostat, Paris, 1881; and Schapp's Church History, vol. 3].

JULIAN CAESARINI, or CESARINI, belonged to a distinguished Roman family, and attracted the attention of the curia by his successively as a teacher of humaniora and canon law in the university of Padua. Having entered the papal service, he was made a cardinal in 1426, and used in many difficult affairs. The Husite question was confided to him, and he entered Bohemia at the head of a crusading army; but the army was defeated, and the cardinal fled (1431). From 1431 to 1438 he presided over the Council of Basel with great distinction. In 1438 and 1439 he was active in Florence and Ferrara, and in 1440 he went to Hungary to stir up a war against the Turks. He succeeded; but in 1444 the Hungarians were defeated at Vama, and the cardinal perished on the flight, probably assassinated.

JULIUS is the name of three popes.—*Julius I* (337—April 12, 352) sided with Athanasius in the Arian controversy, and sent his legates to the Council of Sardica, which, "from regard to the memory of the apostle Peter," conceded to the Pope the right of accepting appeals from

---

**JULIUS.**
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JUMPERS.

Bishops who had been deposed by a provincial synod. His letters are found in Migne: Patr. Lat., viii.; his life, in Muratori: Rer. Ital. Script., iii. 1. See Friedrich: Geschichte des Primates, Bonn, 1879. — Julius II. (Oct. 31, 1503—Feb. 20, 1513), b. at Albizola, near Savona, 1443, in humble circumstances; was educated to become a merchant, but entered the service of the Church, when his uncle, Francesco Rovere, became a cardinal; and was made a cardinal himself (1471) when the uncle ascended the papal throne. Under Sextus IV., however, he was not much used. Under Innocent VIII. he exercised more influence. Alexander VI. was his deadly enemy. He fled to France; and, though he afterwards condescended to conduct the negotiations for the marriage of Cesar Borgia, a reconciliation never was effected. During the last year of the reign of Alexander VI. he was compelled to keep himself concealed in order to escape the dagger and the poison of the Pope. After the short reign of Pius III., he himself ascended the papal throne. His great object was the aggrandizement of the States of the Church, the formation of an independent state of military and political consequence in Central Italy under the Pope; and he partially succeeded. But the means he employed — the most unscrupulous diplomacy, the fiercest and bloodiest wars — were such that people turned away from him with horror. To wrench the Romagna from the Venetian, he formed the League of Cambray with German, French, and Spain; but, when he had reached his goal, he wheeled around, and formed the Holy League with Venice and Spain against France, and for the purpose of obtaining Ferrara. At one moment his position was very dangerous. Lewis XII. stood in Italy; Maximilian thought of making himself pope; even the cardinals abandoned his cause. But he succeeded in drawing, first England, afterwards even Germany, into the Holy League; the result of which was that the French left Italy; and Ferrara, Parma, and Piacenza were incorporated with the Papal States. In the fields of science and art he was as ardent and energetic as in those of politics and war. He built the largest part of the Church of St. Peter, when he died, he left a treasure worth half a million of ducats. His bulls are found in Balan: Giulio II. nel 1511, e Giulio III. nel 1551 e 1552; 2d ed., Mirandola, 1875. B. Zöpfelfel.

JULIUS AFRICANUS, Sextus, one of the most prominent ecclesiastical scholars from the first half of the third century. He was educated to become a copist; wrote during the reigns of Heliogabalus and Alexander Severus, and died after 240. The date and place of his birth and death are unknown; but Suidas says he was a native of Libya. He lived in Emmaus (Nicopolis), in Palestine; went once to Alexandria to hear Haccaius; was another time sent on a mission to Heliogabalus to work for the rebuilding of the city; maintained friendly relations with that Agbar whose name is connected with Bardeanes; and used the archives of Edessa. The circumstance that he was sent to Heliogabalus, and afterwards dedicated his works to Alexander Severus, indicates that he was a distinguished person. His principal work was his Chronographia, a world's history, beginning with the creation, 5499 B.C., and ending with the third year of the reign of Heliogabalus. It is first mentioned by Eusebius, who appears to have used it very largely in his Chronicle. Only fragments of it have come down to us, the most complete collection of which is that by Routh, in Relig. Sacr., ii. Two epistles of exegetical import are still extant, one to Origen, on the genuineness of the story of Susannah in the Book of Daniel; and another to Aristides, on the genealogies of Christ in Matthew and Luke. Of the latter we have only fragments, collected by F. Spitta (Der Brief des Julius Africanus an Aristides, Halle, 1871).

Of the work ἑμβολία, "embroiderings," a large compilation in many books, dedicated to Alexander Severus, two books on military matters have come down to us. Besides these, quite a number of other works are ascribed to Julius Africanus. See Migne: Patr. Græc., x.; and H. Geiler: Sextus Julius Africanus u. d. byzantinische Chronographie, i. Die Chronographie, Leipzig, 1880, 1885.

ADOLF HARNACK.

JUMPERS, a designation applied to some Welsh religiousists of the last century, who introduced into their worship the practice of dancing and jumping. Under date of June 27, 1763, John Wesley wrote from Wales, "There is here [at Lancroyes] what some call a great reformation in religion among the Methodists; but the case is really this: they have a sort of rustic dance in their public worship, which they call religious dancing, in imitation of David's dancing before the ark." This practice started with the Welsh Methodists, and was confined to a small circle. It was at first simply one of the bodily manifestations which followed the fervent preaching of the Methodists. In favor of the more formal practice two passages were quoted, "David danced before the Lord with all his might," and "I saw David leaping and dancing before the Lord" (2 Sam. vi. 14-16), and "Rejoice ye in that day, and leap for joy" (Luke vi. 23). William Williams, the famous Welsh hymn-writer, and for many years a devoted pastor in Wales, advocated and adopted the practice. The jumping followed the sermon, and was preceded by the singing of a verse of some hymn, which was
repeated again and again, sometimes forty or even more times. The jumping was accompanied with all kinds of gestures, and often lasted for hours. Mr. Wesley regarded this practice as not since men, with the love of God in their heart; but “they have little experience of the ways of God or the devices of Satan” (Tyerman, Life of John Wesley, ii. pp. 480, 481). It is doubtful whether this practice has any followers now in Wales. In the middle ages the sect called the Dancers (see art.) indulged in the same odd religious rites; and the Shakers (see art.) still perpetuate it. See Evans: Denominations of the Christian World, London, 1811; and Tyerman: Life of John Wesley, vol. ii. pp. 480, 481.

JUNILIUS, a native of Africa, a contemporary of Cassiodorus; lived in Constantinople, where he held a high position in the civil administration under Justinian. In 551 he published a book (Instituta regularia divinae legis) generally but erroneously called De partibus divinae legis, after the heading of the first chapter. The work, which is one of the first attempts in the field of biblical introduction, is dedicated to Bishop Primus; and in the dedication the author states that he has derived the contents of his work from a certain Paulus, a native of Persia, and a pupil of the famous school of Nisibis. The work is found in Migne, Patr. Lat., lxviii., and has recently been edited by Kihn, Freiburg, 1880. See G. A. Beekh: Das System des Kirchenwalters, i., Lübeck, 1787; Kihn: Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Africanus, Freiburg, 1879. W. MöLLER.

JUNIUS, Franciscus (Du Jon), b. at Bourges 1545; d. at Leyden 1602; studied theology in Geneva; was appointed pastor of the Walloon congregation in Antwerp 1565; accompanied the Prince of Orange as camp-preacher in the campaign of 1568; settled in 1573 at Heidelberg, on the invitation of the elector, and worked with Tremellius on the translation of the Old Testament; and was in 1582 made professor of theology at Leyden. Besides his translation of the Old Testament, he wrote exegetical, philological, and polemical treatises, which have been collected in two volumes folio, also containing his biography, Geneva, 1615, republished under the editorship of Abraham Kuyper, Amsterdam, 1882 sqq.

JUNKIN, George, D.D., L.L.D., a prominent Presbyterian clergyman and educator; b. near Kingston, Penn., Nov. 1, 1790; d. in Philadelphia, May 20, 1868. He graduated at Jefferson College; studied theology under Dr. John M. Mason in New York; was pastor of the churches at Milton and McKenney, Penn.; and in 1832 became president of Lafayette College. He occupied this position till 1841, when he accepted the presidency of Miami University, which he resigned in 1844 to return to his old place at Lafayette, which he filled till 1848, when he became president of Washington College at Lexington, Va. Here he remained till 1851, when his loyalty to the Union forced him to return to the North. Dr. Junkin exercised a large influence upon the Presbyterian Church; was a keen and logical debater, and one of the leaders and warmest adherents of the Old School branch after the division. He was moderator of the General Assembly of 1848, although belonging to a different presbytery. He was moderator of the Old School Assembly in 1844. Among his works are Treatise on Justification, Philadelphia, 1838, The Little Stone and the Great Image, or Lectures on the Prophecies, etc. (delivered before Lafayette College, 1838-39), Philadelphia, 1844, Commentary on the Hebrews, Philadelphia, 1873, etc.

JURIEU, Pierre, b. at Mer, Dec. 24, 1637; d. at Rotterdam, Jan. 11, 1713; studied theology at Saumur and Sedan; travelled in Holland and England; and was appointed professor of theology at Sedan, 1675, and, after the suppression of that institution in 1681, at Rotterdam. Even his first works, Examen du livre de la réunion du Christianisme, 1671, Traité de la Dévotion, 1674 (translated into English), etc., as well as his lectures at Sedan, gave him a prominent position in the Reformed Church; and his fame and authority were greatly enhanced by his Apologie pour la morale des Réformés, 1675 (against Bossuet), Lettres Pastorales, 1686-87, etc., as well as by his zeal and disinterestedness in aiding his persecuted brethren of the Reformed Church. But the mistakes and calamities he witnessed after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes led him, as so many others, to seek for consolation in the apocalyptic prophecies of Scripture (Accomplissement des Prophéties, 1688); and this circumstance, in connection with the great vehemence which he exhibited in his controversies with Bayle and others, made him many enemies; and at one time even his own orthodoxy was impugned. His Histoire critique des Dogmes et des Cultes, 1704, translated into English (London, 1715, 2 vols.), was his last great work.

A. SCHWIZER.

JURISDICTION, Ecclesiastical. Occasioned by the admonition of Paul, that Christians should not bring their cases of litigation before unbelieving judges (1 Cor. vi. 1 sqq.), and modelled after the practice of the synagogue, which had received the sanction of the State (Josephus: Antiq., 14, 10), there early developed among the Christians a form of ecclesiastical procedure devolving upon the head of the congregation, and comprising not only ecclesiastical, but also civil affairs. As no doubt, most, if not all, of the judges of the State, were Pagans at the time when Christianity was publicly recognized by the government as the reigning religion, it was simply a measure of due protection, when, by a decree of 331, Constantine formally legalized the institution, and extended its compass so far that the ecclesiastical court became competent, even in cases in which only one of the litigant parties chose to go before it. Half a century later on, when the judges of the State had become Christians themselves, it was found undesirable, because unnecessary, to give the ecclesiastical jurisdiction so wide a scope; and, by a decree of Arcadius and Honorius (398), the competence of the ecclesiastical court was made dependent upon the agreement of both parties. In general, the definition by the Roman law may be summed up in this way. With respect to the laity,—all common crimes were to be punished by the civil courts, the Church simply following after with the penalty; but all infringements of the order of the Church, doctrinal or disciplinary, were to be punished by the Church herself (Cod. Theod. de princ. et cleric. XI: 17, 3, 41, 47, Cod. Theod. de eccl. et cleric. XVI: 2; and c. 1, Cod. Theod. de relig., XVI. 11). With respect to
the clergy, — originally all common crimes committed by the clergy were reported to the bishop, who then deposed the culprit, and surrendered him to the civil courts for punishment; but by Justinian (Nov., LXXIX., LXXXIII. princi. CXXIII. cap. 8, 21, 22) the clergy was made amenable, even in civil cases, to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction only.

As Christianity became established in the Frankish Empire and Germany, the principle of ecclesiastical jurisdiction was introduced; but the institution developed very slowly. With respect to civil suits, the State, or rather the ruler, granted, first, that no clerk should be bound to appear before a secular court, either as plaintiff or as defendant, without the consent of his bishop (Concil. Aurelian., III. a. 538, can. 32; IV. a. 541, can. 20); second, that, when both parties belonged to the clergy, the case should always be decided in an ecclesiastical court (Concil. Maih., I. a. 534; Caroli bIagni leges Langobard., c. 38, c. 39); third, that, whenever a clerk was implicated in a case, a mixed court should be formed, of which his bishop was a member (Capit. Franco-furt., a. 794, c. 50; Caroli Magni leges Langobard., c. 89); and, finally, that the clergy could be cited only before the ecclesiastical courts (the principle of Justinian recognized by the Constit. Frederici II. a. 1220, c. 4). With respect to criminal cases, all jurisdiction belonged originally to the State, both among the Franks and the Germans. For all common crimes, not ecclesiastical, such as murder, theft, adultery, etc., the clergy were punished by the secular courts. Only the bishops formed an exception: they were judged by the synods, though the State had a right to take part in the prosecution. But in 614 an edict of Clo-
tar II. (Pertz: Monum. German., iii. 14) granted that only the lower clergy, inclusive of the sub-deacon, and only the minor and patent crimes, were amenable to the secular jurisdiction, while under other circumstances a mixed court should be formed, with the bishop for its president. Finally, towards the close of the eighth century, the clergy was completely exempted from the secular jurisdiction, and in the eleventh century (Capit. Francof., a. 789, a. 794, c. 38; a. 803, c. 12): the police authorities could only arrest the criminal monk or priest, not prosecute, and still less punish him. It must be ob-
erved, however, that practice did not in this field keep step with theory. Even in Italy, those cities which did not belong immediately to the papal dominion continued to assert their right of jurisdic-
tion over the clergy in all criminal cases, though synods after synod, and pope after pope, from Urban II. to Leo X., continued to fulminate their curses against the clergy.

From an early date the right of ecclesiastical jurisdiction developed along a double track, con-
quering new territory both through the cases and through the persons that it succeeded in bringing under its authority; and, such as it once for all stood defined by canon law, it is indeed fully equipped to supersede at any given opportunity, the right of secular jurisdiction altogether. Ac-
cording to canon law, the cases subject to ecclesiastical jurisdiction are: I. Causae mære, pure, in-
rinsece spiritualis, belonging to faith, doctrine, sacraments, liturgy, ceremonies, etc., most of which fall entirely outside of the competency of a civil court; while others — as, for instance, marriage cases — contain one or more elements, which, being defined as of sacramental nature, — such as prohibited degrees of kinship, divorce, etc., — necessarily bring them before the ecclesiastical court; II. Causae ex pure spiritualibus dependentes, extrinsec spiritalis, such as engagements to marriage, patronage, ecclesiastical benefits, burial, tithes, etc.; and, finally, III. Causae civiles ecclesiasticis accessoriae mixtae, such as pecuniary questions arising from marriage, inheritance, legitimate birth, etc. But, as canon law includes under the last head all that can be brought under ecclesiastical jurisdiction by the so-called denunciation evang hica, there is, indeed, no case imaginable which the ecclesiastical court is incompetent to decide. The persons, who, ac-
cording to canon law, are subject to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, are ecclesiastics of all degrees and orders, any one who by the tonsure is designated as belonging to the clerical state, monks and nuns, ecclesiastical institutions of all descriptions, schools and universities, with their teachers and pupils, pilgrims and crusaders, and, as it is the duty of the Church to take care of all personae miserales, also poor people, widows, orphans, and penitents. Of course, all persons not belonging under “this head” have a right to prefer a secular court in all secular affairs; but if a question should arise, whether or not a certain person belongs under “this head,” it is the ecclesiastical court which gives the answer.

As above mentioned, this idea of an ecclesiastical jurisdiction superseding or absorbing the jurisdicti of the State was nowhere fully reali-
ized. But, on the other hand, the Church of Rome never ceased to fight for its realizat
and, when the modern State began to develop, sharp conflicts arose. Already, during the first half of the thirteenth century, the encroachments of the ecclesiastical courts called forth determined protest in France; and in that country they never attained competency in cases about real estate, even though there were laws in the case.

As the continual case went on, Boniface VIII. ended favorably to the liberty of the Gallican Church, several edicts were issued during the fourteenth century, circumscribing the competency of the ecclesiastical courts; and the parliaments were not slow in enforcing those edicts against the refractory clergy. By the edict of 1530 the Church was practically deprived of all jurisdiction over lay people, except in purely spiritual cases, such as vows, oaths, etc.; and the fundamental maxim from which the whole French process developed during the seventeenth century, Toute justice émane du roi, was in direct opposition to that on which canon law was founded. During the Revolution, finally, by the Civil Constitu of the clergy, Aug. 24, 1790, all ecclesiastical courts were suppressed; and the bishop retained a kind of jurisdiction only over the inferior clergy of his diocese and in purely ecclesiastical affairs. The legislation of the first empire and the Restoration did not materially alter this state of affairs, though the Code Napoleon laid matrimonial cases under ecclesiastical jurisdicti

In 1820, however, the Bishop of Metz, on his own account, a court, to which
he invited his flock to resort for advice and judgment. The example was followed in other dioceses; and such courts still exist in France, neither forbidden nor recognized by the State.

In Germany the opposition to the jurisdiction usurped by the Church also began in the thirteenth century. Laymen were forbidden, under severe penalties, to cite other laymen before an ecclesiastical court. (Sachen speigel Landrecht, book 1, art. 87; Buch iii. art. 87, § 1; Hamburger Slululen 1270, xix. 15); and in real actions ecclesiastics were demanded to appear before the secular judge (Schwabisches Landrecht, art. 95). Nevertheless, the principle of denunciatio evangelica continued in active operation till the middle of the fifteenth century, and a well-marked boundary-line was not drawn between the jurisdiction of the Church and that of the State until the middle of the sixteenth century. In consequence of the Hundert Bescheiden der deutschen Nation, 1522, all causa mixtie and a great number of causa extrinsice spiritualues were referred to the courts of the State, and since that time a re-action against the right of ecclesiastical jurisdiction has been steadily at work in Germany. In Austria the ecclesiastical courts are, at present, competent only in cases concerning faith, sacraments, and discipline. Even marriage cases belong exclusively under the civil courts. In Prussia, where, according to the reigning idea of the State, all jurisdiction ought to belong to the State, it is only a regard to the conscience of the Roman-Catholic part of the population which has prevented the government from abolishing the ecclesiastical jurisdiction altogether. Even in purely disciplinary affairs, the so-called "Falk Laws" have confined the ecclesiastical authority within very narrow bounds.

In the various countries in which the Reformation took root, various lines of policy were pursued, though the general principle seems to be nearly the same. With respect to all civil affairs, Luther said, "With the burgomaster's business I will not meddle;" and he consequently surrendered this whole field of ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the State. Nevertheless, when a consistorial constitution was established, the consistory stepped adroitly into the shoes of the bishop, and the forum ecclesiasticum personarum et rerum again flourished in many Lutheran countries until the replacement of the principle of territorialism by that of toleration, and still more the separation of the Church from the State, gradually caused it to disappear. The development was very unequal, however, in the various countries. In Prussia all marriage cases were referred to the civil courts in 1748; in Hanover, not until 1869. The Presbyterian churches also exercised some kind of jurisdiction in civil affairs through their synods, but only in some countries (as, for instance, Holland) and for a short time. In England the ecclesiastical court is still competent in marriage cases, will cases, etc. With respect to purely spiritual and ecclesiastical affairs, the Lutheran churches were often so closely united with the states to which they belonged, that the minister of worship and public education exercised their civil rights as far as they adhered to his ideas; while a police-officer counted the persons present at service in the church, and fined the absent. But by degrees, as the idea of separating the Church from the State gains ground, they have succeeded in regaining control over their own affairs,—a point in which the Presbyterian churches always have excelled them.

"Maxier.

JUSTIFICATION. The doctrine of justification by faith, and by faith alone, was the one in which the churches of the Reformation, especially the Lutheran Church, recognized their essential and central teaching. It was founded upon the historical or practical teaching of the standing or falling church (articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesie), the one upon which hung the very existence of evangelical Christianity. This was expressed by one of the German princes, a most faithful confessor of the gospel, when he told one of his theologians just starting out for a disputation with the Catholics, that that which lay nearest to his heart was that they should return with the little word sola, referring to the proposition, "Man is justified by faith alone" (sola fide justificari hominem). It is not surprising, that, in the development of this doctrine over against the attacks of the opposing party, various shades of distinction should have manifested themselves. We shall first direct our attention to the teaching of the Scriptures, and to the conception of that teaching in the Church prior to the Reformation.

The classic and biblical use of the Greek word δικαιοσύνη ("to justify") differs in a remarkable manner. In the first case it designates the re-action of offended justice upon the offender,—to make righteous; i.e., to remove the offence against justice from the offender, by his condemnation or punishment (Herodotus, Thucydides, Plato). In the second it means the very opposite; namely, to exculpate, to declare righteous, be it that the individual himself is blameless, or that, having offended justice, he is exculpated, made free of guilt, by the divine goodness, and thereby is declared and treated as having satisfied the divine demands, and as being righteous. The Old-Testament use of the term prevails in Matthew (xi. 19, xii. 37) and Luke (vii. 29, x. 29, xvi. 15). Its first use in the strict New-Testament sense occurs in the account of the penitent publican (Luke xviii. 14), who is said to have been regarded as just by God (δικαιοσύνη). It is, however, in the Pauline writings, especially the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, that the word occurs in the specific sense. After describing, in the Epistle to the Romans, the law and its works as incapable of justifying, or making righteous, inasmuch as the law only serves to give a knowledge of sin (iii. 20, vii. 7 sqq.), the apostle takes up a righteousness of God with which the law has nothing to do, and which is mediated by faith in Christ, and extends to all believers. This righteousness is described as passing over to offending humanity by reason of grace on God's part, and of the redemption of Christ, on account of whose atoning death God had determined that there should be no contradiction between his own justice and the justification of believers (iii. 26). Then, after having established the proposition of justification by faith in chap. iii., Paul passes over, in the next chapter, to show that this idea does not contradict the revelation in the Old Testament, and that the object of justification, and becomes so, not on account of his own deeds, or in the way of a debt, but on account of grace, he renouncing all
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justification, on the other hand, regards justifying faith as fides formata, i.e., faith which is inspired by love; so that this love, active in faith, is really that whereby and on account of which man is justified, or whereby man renders himself worthy of forgiveness and sanctifying grace. Love is an act of free will. The evangelical doctrine of justification, on the other hand, which has its roots in the sense of sin as guilt, regards such a feeling of love in the heart for God as being a consequence of God's act, removing guilt, and drawing him to himself. This justifying activity of God presupposes nothing in man except a sense of sin, which is a product of divine grace, or the divine Spirit operating upon man's conscience, and implanting a knowledge of God's holiness and of his own violation of that holiness in his conduct. This frame of heart is a receptive condition for justifying grace: hence arises faith, which proceeds from knowledge implanted by the Holy Spirit (notitia), and passes on to assent (assenus) and trust (fiducia). Here love for God is for the first time felt (1 John iv. 10, 19); and from it proceeds sanctification, or the fruits of righteousness. Thus faith works through love (Gal. v. 6). Thus the Scripture distinctly renders to God all the glory, depriving man of all meritousness. Man, like an empty vessel, is filled more and more by God, and assumes likeness with Christ.

There was a danger of regarding faith more as a theoretical assent, and unduly emphasizing justification by putting sanctification in the background. The imputation of Christ's merit was made prominent in such a way that vital union with Christ was more or less lost sight of. There was a peril of the old man, with its sinful lusts, being lulled to sleep without having been sanctified. To resist this evil, Andreas Osiander appeared against the school of Melanchthon, which was inclined to modify the Lutheran view. He substituted a real impartation of Christ's righteousness for the judicial imputation. Christ is righteous so far as he is the righteousness of God; and man is made righteous by laying hold of it by faith, and thereby receiving the divine nature of Christ to reside in him. God regards him as righteous, therefore, because he sustained the relation to Christ of the branch to the vine. But in this view the humanity of Christ and his ethical mediation are not properly brought out. The Formula of Concord, on the other hand, emphasizes that Christ is our righteousness in his entire divine-human personality, and redeems us by his perfect obedience.

The distinction between the Lutheran and Reformed doctrines of justification becomes apparent from another standpoint. Schneckenburger brought out this difference with great acuteness. It arises, in part, from a difference of view about man's natural state and the relation of the divine decree of predestination to human freedom. The theologians of the Reformed Church regard the natural condition of fallen man from the standpoint of misery and want, and consequently look upon salvation as that which effects their removal, and imparts a positive benefit. The divine election is the first principle in this process, and reveals itself in the call which excites faith. By this faith the sinner apprehends Christ, and
is made one with him, a new man (Eph. iv. 21). He thus becomes conscious of justification as a divine justifying decision. In the Lutheran system, on the other hand, the justification of the sinner as sinful is the principle, the first step, from which all else proceeds. It is the divine decision, based upon the satisfaction of Christ for sin, by which God declares the sinner righteous, and adopts him as his child. In this case the divine decision of justification is the efficient force which engenders faith in the heart of the subject. This work is completed by the participation in the sacraments. Justification does not insure the permanent continuance of the subject in the state of grace; he may fall away from it. A renewal of repentance on his part insures the renewal of justification. This is the doctrine of the Lutheran Church. According to the Reformed doctrine, however, the sinner cannot fall away from this state.

It is apparent that the difference in the two conceptions is owing to the different place which the doctrine of election has in the two systems, it being the all-determining principle in the Reformed system.

The doctrine of the Reformed Church is logically the more perfect, as it starts from the divine decree of election, and passes on, by logical necessity, to the absolute efficiency of the act of justification, which nothing can overthrow. For this reason, some Lutheran theologians, as Nitzsch, Von Hofmann, Philippus, and Dorner, have shown that the doctrine of election in the two systems, it being the all-determining principle in the Reformed system.

The doctrine of the Reformed Church is logically the more perfect, as it starts from the divine decree of election, and passes on, by logical necessity, to the absolute efficiency of the act of justification, which nothing can overthrow. For this reason, some Lutheran theologians, as Nitzsch, Von Hofmann, Philippus, and Dorner, have shown that the doctrine of election in the two systems, it being the all-determining principle in the Reformed system.

The doctrine of the Reformed Church is logically the more perfect, as it starts from the divine decree of election, and passes on, by logical necessity, to the absolute efficiency of the act of justification, which nothing can overthrow. For this reason, some Lutheran theologians, as Nitzsch, Von Hofmann, Philippus, and Dorner, have shown that the doctrine of election in the two systems, it being the all-determining principle in the Reformed system.
Justinian I.

Justin I.,—a Dacian peasant who served in the Imperial Guard, owed his advancement to the size of his body and the strength of his limbs, and in 519, so it is said, he was able to snatch the imperial diadem from the head of the emperor who had it. He received an excellent education; and, though he never learned to speak Greek without a foreign accent, he was well prepared when he succeeded to the throne.

The most brilliant feature of the reign of Justinian I. was his legislation, or rather his codification of the already existing Roman law, executed by several committees, of which Trebonius was the inspiring soul, and resulting in the so-called Corpus Juris Justiniani. By this work he conferred a great and lasting benefit, not only on the Roman...
Empire, but on civilization at large. Of a questionable value, however, were his conquests of Africa, Southern Spain, and Italy, by his two famous generals, Belisarius and Narses. He was unable to preserve these conquests; and, what was still worse, he was unable to give the conquered countries a better government than that they had enjoyed under their barbarian rulers. Altogether objectionable, finally, was his ecclesiastical policy, — that part of his activity on which he bestowed the greatest amount of industry and care.

Justinian I. was a Christian, orthodox, full of zeal for the purity of the faith, and waging a perpetual war against Paganism and heresy. The lower classes of the population were still Pagan in many places, as, for instance, in Peloponnesus and the interior of Asia Minor; and in the upper strata of society there reigned a wide-spread religious indifference. The latter, Justinian I. compelled to conform, at least externally, to Christianity; and with respect to the former he boasted of conversions by the thousands. The philosophical schools of Athens he closed in 529, and banished the teachers. They went to Persia; but, by the intercession of Chosroes, they were afterwards allowed to return. Less leniently he treated the Christian heretics,—the Montanists, Nestorians, Eutychians, and others; and the marvellous success of the Mohammedan invasion of Egypt and Syria half a century later is generally ascribed to the total disaffection of the population, which resulted from the ecclesiastical policy of Justinian.

The inhabitants of Egypt, Syria, and parts of Asia Minor, were Monophysites, and rejected the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon (451) as tainted with Nestorianism. Between orthodoxy and Monophysitism a compromise was brought about by Zeno's Henotikon (482); but that document, which the bishops of the Eastern Church had been compelled to subscribe to, was absolutely rejected by the Western Church, and formally anathematized by Felix II. In order to heal the schism thus established between the Eastern and the Western Church, Justinian repealed the Henotikon immediately after his accession. But then something had to be done with the Monophysites in order to prevent a schism within the Eastern Church. The empress Theodora, who was a secret Monophysite, persuaded her husband that the true reason why the Monophysites refused to accept the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, was that the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and Ibas, had not been condemned; and that non-condemnation the Monophysites considered as implying a positive confirmation. The emperor then issued a decree condemning the above writings, and the condemnation was repeated by the fifth ecumenical Council of Constantinople (553). The Monophysites were satisfied; but what was won in the East was lost in the West by the breaking-out of the Three Chapter controversy, so called because, in Justinian's decree of condemnation, there were three parts, or "chapters," relating to Theodore's writings and person, to Theodoret's treatise, and to Ibas' letter respectively. See art. Three Chapters.

At last the old emperor himself lapsed into heresy. He adopted the Aphthartodocetic views of the incorruptibility of the human body of Christ, and issued a decree to force them upon the Church. But Aphthartodocetism is simply Monophysitism, and thus his principal dogmatical labors met with a somewhat similar fate to that which has overtaken his chief architectural monument. He built the Church of St. Sophia in Constantinople; and this church, once the most magnificent cathedral of Christendom, is now a Turkish mosque.


Juvenecus, Caius Vettius Aquilius, a Spaniard by birth, and presbyter of his native church; wrote, about 330, a Historia evangelica, or Versus de quatuor Evangeliiis, a poetical transcription of the gospel history, in 3,233 Latin hexameters. The text which he used, and to which he kept very closely, was partly the Greek original, partly the oldest Latin translation, the so-called Italia. The contents thus derived, he moulded in forms borrowed principally from Virgil, but also from Lucan, Lucretius, and Ovid, and generally arranged with adroitness. The result has, at all events, interest, as the first Christian epic: in its own time, and during the middle ages, it enjoyed a great reputation. It was first printed at Deventer, 1490; afterwards often, as, for instance, in Migne: Patr. Lat., vol. xix. Several other poems, especially, the Liber in Genesin, have been ascribed to Juvenecus, but erroneously, as it would seem.

See A. R. Geiser: Diss. de J. Vita et Scripta, Jena, 1877.

Wagenmann.
KAABA (square house), the sacred shrine of the Mohammedans, in which is the Black Stone. It stands within the court of the great mosque at Mecca; is oblong in shape; built of large, irregular, and unpolished blocks of stone; is about forty feet in height; has no windows, and only one door, which is raised seven feet above the ground. The (reddish-) Black Stone is a fragment of volcanic basalt, sprinkled with colored crystals. According to Mohammedan tradition, it was originally white, but was blackened by the kisses of sinful mortals. It is inserted in the north-east corner of the building, some five feet above the floor; is an irregular oval, and about seven inches in diameter. It has a band of silver around it. The Kaaba may be called the centre of the Mohammedan world. All Moslems turn toward it in prayer. It is, however, far older than Mohammed; the worship of the Black Stone being well-nigh primitive with the Arabs, who came to kiss it, and make seven kisses of sinful mortals. It is inserted in the Black Stone. Its actual age is unknown; but it was rebuilt in Mohammed's family long before his birth; and it was to his uncle, Abu Talib, the guardian of the Kaaba, that he owed his protection for years. Arab tradition attributes the Kaaba's first erection to Adam and Eve, and its second to Abraham and Ishmael, to whom Gabriel brought from heaven the Black Stone. Its actual age is unknown; but it was rebuilt in Mohammed's thirty-fifth year (605 A.D.), and his son, Talib, the Black Stone, in its place. For an interesting description of the Kaaba, see Richard F. Burton's Pilgrimage to El Medina and Mecca, London, 1855, 3 vols. (vol. iii).

KA'DESH (En-mish'pat, Ka'desh-bar'nes, Mer'ibah-Ka'desh). Scarcely any biblical site has proved a more vexed question than this. Some have unnecessarily inclined to look for two sites to meet the conditions of the text. Later investigations have freed the question of many difficulties, and tended to fix the location at an oasis about ninety miles southerly from Hebron, the name Qadis, the Arabic equivalent of the Hebrew Kadesh. Kadesh is first mentioned (Gen. xiv. 7) as on the route of Chedorlaomer, from the wilderness of Paran northward; again as a boundary limit eastward for locating the homes of Hagar (Gen. xvi. 14) and of Abraham (Gen. xx. 1). Later it appears as a city in the southern boundary of the Negeb, or south country, southward of the hill country of the Amorites, northward of the Wilderness of Paran, in the Wilderness of Zin, westward of the territory of Edom. (Cf. Num. xiii. 17, 26, xx. 14, 18, xxvii. 14, xxxii. 30, xxxiv. 4; Deut. i. 19, 20.) A notable fountain, called the "Well of Judgement," was at Kadesh (Gen. xiv. 7), proceeding from a cliff (Num. xx. 8). A wilderness about it bore its name (Ps. xxxix. 8). It was a suitable abode for the host of Israel (Deut. i. 40). A mountain was just north of it toward Canaan (Num. xiii. 17; Deut. i. 20, 24). It was distant from Mount Sinai an eleven-days' journey (Deut. i. 2).

Kadesh was an objective point of the Israelites when they left Sinai for the borders of the promised land (Deut. i. 6, 7, 19—21). Thence the spies were sent into Canaan (Num. xiii. 17, 26). There the people rebelled, through fear and a lack of faith, and were sentenced to a forty-years' stay in the wilderness (Num. xiv.). Kadesh seems to have been the headquarters or rallying-place of the Israelites during their wanderings (Deut. i. 40). They re-assembled there for a final move toward Canaan (Num. xx. 1). There Miriam died and was buried; the people murmured for lack of water; the rock gave forth water miraculously. Moses, having sinned in spirit and act at this time, was sentenced to die without entering Canaan (Num. xx. 1—13). Thence Moses sent messengers to the kings of Edom and Moab, requesting permission to pass through their territory (Num. xx. 14—21; Judg. xi. 16, 17). Being refused this permission, the Israelites journeyed to Mount Hor, and thence made a circuit around Edom and Moab toward the Jordan (Num. xxxi. 4; Deut. ii. 1—8). Kadesh is named prominently as a landmark in the southern boundary-line of the promised land (Num. xxxiv. 4; Josh. xv. 3; Ezek. xlvii. 18, xlviii. 28). Its location is admitted to be a key to both the wanderings of the Israelites and the boundary of their domain.

All the conditions of the Bible-text are met in Qadis, as in no other suggested site. A Wady Qadis, a Jebel Qadis, and an 'Ain Qadis are there. Wady Qadis is an extensive hill-encircled region of sufficient extent to encamp and guard a host like Israel's. Large portions of it are arable. Extensive primitive ruins are about it. Springs of rare abundance and sweetness flow from under a high cliff. By name and by tradition it is the site of Kadesh. Just north of it is a lofty mountain, over which is a camel-pass toward Hebron. It lies just off the only feasible route for an invading army from the direction of Sinai, or from east of Akaba, and is well adapted for a protected strategic point of rendezvous prior to an immediate move northward. It is at that central position of the southern boundary-line of Canaan which is given to Kadesh in its later mentions in the Bible-text. Its relations to the probable limits of Edom and to all the well-identified sites of Southern Canaan, and its distance from Mount Sinai, conform to the Bible record.

Rowlands, in 1842, was the first modern traveler to visit 'Ain Qadis, and identify it with Kadesh. His identification has been accepted by Ritter, Winer, Kurtz, Tuch, Keil, Delitzsch, Fries, Ka lisch, Knobel, Bunsen, Menke, Hamburger, Muhlau and Volek, Wilton, Palmer, Wilson, Alford, Wordsworth, Tristram, Edersheim, Geikie, Bartlett, Lowrie, and many others. Trumbull visited this site in 1881, and added confirmatory evidence of its identity with Kadesh.

Dean Stanley, resting on ambiguous references in the Talmud, Josephus, Eusebius, and Jerome, advocated Potra as the site of Kadesh, but that, being in the heart of hostile Edom, is clearly
inadmissible (Deut. ii. 5, 8). Burckhardt pro-
posed the entire 'Arabah as the site; and, after
him, others suggested various points in or near
the 'Arabah; e.g., Robinson, 'Ain el-Weibeh;
Von Gerlach, 'Ain el-Maghtarah; Berghaus, Reusa, and Buddeus, a point near
Exion-geber: Laborde, Emamash in Wady Je-
räfah; Dr. William Smith, 'Ain esh-Shehabeh;
Bertou, Kadaresas on Jebel Mâdtra. Rabbi Schwarz
named Wady Gaian, not far from Wady Qadis;
Henry Crossley made an ingenious argument for
Elusa, or El Khalasch; but only 'Ain el-Weibeh
has had any considerable support against 'Ain
Qadis among scholars.

Dr. Robinson presses the claim of 'Ain el-
Weibeh; and he is followed by Hitzig, Von
Gerlach, Clark, Hayman, Esip, Porter, Stewart,
Payne Smith, Faussel, Durbin, Coleman, and
others. For this site are urged its proximity to
the supposed but disputed borders of Edom and
the traditional Mount Hor, and the fact that it
is a much frequented watering-place of caravans
to-day. The chief objections to this identifica-
tion are; that it would have brought the Israe-
ites into a defenceless position in the face of their
enemies; that it is not on the route otherwise
indicated as taken by them toward Canaan; that
it would be counte on the eastern, rather than
the southern, border-line of Canaan, according to
the description of that boundary; that it occupies
no such central position in the southern border-
line as the text gives to Kadesh; that it shows
no such cliff as the narrative indicates; that in
name, traditions, or neighboring ruins, there is
no trace of its conformity with the requirements
of the text: moreover, that the arguments em-
ployed in its favor as against 'Ain Qadis by
Robinson and his followers are largely based on
the strangely erroneous assumption that 'Ain
Qadis is located in Wady el-'Ain.

Lit.—WILLIAMS: The Holy City, London,
1845 (Appendix, pp. 487-492); WILTON: The
Nepheb, London, 1883; PALMER: Desert of the
Ezouz, London, 1871, vol. ii. chap. 4;
ROBINSON: Biblical Researches in Palestine,
Boston, 1874, vol. ii. pp. 175, 194; SMITH: Bible
Dictionary, American edition, New York, 1872
(sub voce "Kadesh"); KEIL and DELITZSCH:
Commentary on the Pentateuch, Edinburgh, 1880,
vol. iii. pp. 82 sq., 133 sq.; KURTZ: History of the
Old Covenant, Edinburgh, 1872, vol. iii.
p. 197-210; CLARK: The Bible Atlas, London, 1868,
p. 24 sqq.; THUMBULL: Kadesh-barnea, New York,
1883.

H. CLAY TRUMBULL.

KADI, the title of an assistant judge among
Mohammedans: the chief judge is called malla,
and both belong to the higher clergy, because
Mohammedan civil law is based upon the Kor-
aan.

KAFFRARIA (from the Arabic, Kafr, "in-
del"), the common but not official name of those
regions of south-eastern Africa which are inhab-
ted by Kaffres. They speak a language under the
Kaffre rule, and was in 1866 incorporated with the Cape
Colony; another is still independent. The Kaffres
form the handsomest and best gifted tribe of the
grey type. They have developed a remarkable
political organization, but in religion they are
very backward. They have no idea of a Supreme
Being; their whole religion
being confined to a kind of ancestry-worship.
Various forms of superstitition, however, have
grown luxuriantly among them; as, for instance,
belief in witchcraft, the medicine-man, etc. The
Moravian Brethren sent the first Christian mis-
ionaries to them 1798: in 1820 followed the Wes-
leyans. At present the Anglican Church, the
Dutch Reformed Church, the German Baptists,
and others, labor with success among them. See
I. SH UETER: Kaffirs of Natal, 1857; L. GROUT:
Zulu-land, 1887; W. HOULDEN: Past and Future
of the Kaffre Races, 1887.

KALDI, George, b. at Tyrnau, Hungary, 1570;
d. in Presburg, 1834; entered the Society of Jesus;
taught theology at Olmütz, and was finally ap-
pointed director of the College of Presburg. He
translated the Bible into Hungarian (Vienna,
1826), in opposition to the translation by the
Reformed Caspar Karoly, 1569. A volume of his
sermons appeared at Presburg, 1861.

KALTEISEN, Heinrich, b. at Ehrenbreitstein;
d. at Coblenz 1465; was educated in the Domini-
can convent of Coblenz; studied in Vienna and
Cologne; and was successively appointed inquisi-
tor-general of Germany, magister sacri palatii
(1443), and bishop of Tronbjem (1492). He owed
most of his reputation to his dispute with the Husites at Basel (1483). The speech he de-
lered on that occasion lasted three days, and is
found in H. CANIUSIUS: Lect. antiq. He was a
prolific writer, but most of his works have re-
mained unprinted.

KANT, Immanuel, was b. at Königsberg, April
22, 1724; lectured in Königsberg from 1755 till
his death; and d. in Königsberg Feb. 12, 1804.
He never travelled away from the centre of his
activity, where he had been introduced into life,
and did his life's work; but he read books of
travel, and conversed with travellers, thereby
obtaining exact acquaintance with the features
of many parts of the world. He lived the life of
the philosophic recluse, concentrating his at-
tention on abstract study; and yet he gathered
around his table men of all classes, so keeping up
a large degree of intercourse with the society of
Königsberg. There is no more marked example
of concentrated philosophic thought than is af-
forded by this even-going life spent in this town
in Northern Prussia. The thinker was the great-
est of abstract thinkers the world has yet seen.
Kant was of Scotch descent, his grandfather hav-
ing emigrated from Scotland at the end of the
seventeenth century. The family name was writ-
ten "Cant," and is still common in Scotland; but
German pronunciation turned it into "Sant," and
that was certain to become "Zant," to guard
against which calumny the philosopher changed
the spelling to "Kant." He was the child of noble,
industrious, religious parents; his mother
having been a woman of lofty ability and char-
ter, whose influence for good over him Kant
acknowledged in the most explicit terms. In
early years Kant was devoted to the study of
classics and mathematics. He entered upon study
for the ministry, and completed his theological
course, and occasionally preached, but did not
give himself to the professional career. His first
efforts in preparation for the press were concerned
with the structure of the universe; and in 1783
he published A General Theory of the Heavens, a
fact which may be noted by those who recall the
enthusiasm with which he spoke of the starry
heavens and the conception of duty as the two
things which most overawed his spirit. This
work he described as an Essay on the Mechanical
Origin of the Structure of the Universe, in which
he seeks to explain the origin of worlds by the
forces of attraction and repulsion. So much
was he addicted to physical research, that he
afterwards lectured on physical geography and
fortification, and for a time gained a considerable
part of his support by teaching the latter subject.
In the same year he published, in Latin, A New
Elucidation of the First Principles of Metaphysical
Knowledge. This he publicly defended as his
thesis when supporting his application to be al-
lowed to teach in the university in the rank of
privat-docent, or non-professorial teacher. This
essay contains the ground of his theory, after-
wards elaborated in the Critique of Pure Reason.
From this time onwards, he taught in the uni-
versity, lecturing on a great variety of subjects,
including, besides the named philos
phies, natural theology, and anthropology. In 1770 he
was appointed professor of philosophy in his own
university, and this fixed his sphere for life. As
a lecturer he was very attractive, clear in style,
varied in the range of illustration, exceedingly
suggestive and stimulating. The most important
autobiographic remark he made—and it has
found general currency in consequence—was,
that by Hume he was awoke from dogmatic slum-
er. He was by natural bias a metaphysician,
and had been deeply pondering metaphysical ques-
tions from his early years; but the sceptical as-
sault of Hume on the experiential philosophy
convinced him that something more was required
than a dogmatic scheme, if philosophy was to
maintain its position. In this way he entered
upon the critical method with the view of distin-
guishing the products of experience from the
elements in consciousness which are given by the
mind. His aim was a thorough-going discrimina-
tion between the a posteriori and the a priori ele-
ments in knowledge. It thus became a search for
the transcendental in consciousness, or the forms
of knowledge which transcend experience. Thus
the two words, "critical" and "transcendental," nat-
urally describe the Kantian philosophy as a scheme
of knowledge.
According to Kant, the forms of the mind are
the native and necessary conditions of knowledge.
Our knowledge is of phenomena, or appearances
possible to us under the forms which our mental
constitution imposes. It follows that we do not
know things in themselves, but only such appear-
ances as are possible to us under the conditions
of knowledge to which we are limited. The
sensory involves recognition of an outer world,
and the forms of the sensory native to mind are
space and time. These two impose their formal
conditions on all experience: accordingly we know
only appearances under these forms peculiar to
us as intelligent beings. In reducing all knowl-
edge to the outer to the phenomenal in this way,
he seems only to help Hume, instead of refuting
him. Kant does not, however, affirm that exter-
nal things do not exist, or that there can be any
rational ground for such an affirmation; he main-
tains only that our knowledge through the sense
is knowledge of appearances under recognized
mental conditions,—an unsatisfactory theory of
external perception, however true in what it af-
irms. With this beginning, the lines of develop-
ment for the theory are fixed. When the under-
standing or reasoning power proceeds to work
up into systematized order the multifarious facts
recognized through the senses, the categories or
pure conceptions of the understanding—unity,
plurality, totality, etc.—"prescribe laws a priori
to phenomena." In this higher region, also, all
that is known is determined by phenomena and
the forms which the understanding imposes. When
we rise still higher, to contemplate the
universe as a whole, there cannot be any thing
but a further illustration of our subjection to the
forms which the mind imposes. The reason gives
us the ideas of God, the universe, and self. These
are the forms prescribed by the highest faculty
we possess; but we are not able to say more of
them than that they are forms of the reason
regulative of intellectual procedure, but not cri-
eria of the named philosophies. But in the mind;
but we have not thereby any knowledge of God,
or certainty of his existence. The argu-
ment which was all in all to Descartes was
nothing to Kant. The error appearing in Kant's
theory at the outset clings to it throughout, leave-
ing us still to seek an adequate theory of knowl-
edge. Kant leads to a sceptical result, if we are
ready to treat his intellectual scheme, developed
in the Critique of Pure Reason, as a complete
theory, and do not advance to his moral philoso-
phy or practical reason as a necessary part of it.
The direct historical result of his Critique has
been the development of a succession of transcen-
dential theories in Germany which have rapidly
worked themselves out of favor, and of a theory
of Agnosticism which has been eagerly embraced
and defended by the experiential school. See
AGNOSTICISM.

The ethical scheme of Kant may, however, be
taken as part of his theory of knowledge, and in
strict justice ought to be so regarded; in which
case it appears that the requirements of practical
life give us certainty as to the divine existence
and government, under which liberty is the birth
right of the moral agent. From pure reason he
passes over to treat of practical reason, which is
given "for the government of will, to constitute
it good." Here we become familiar with the
categorical imperative, whose formula is, "Act
from a maxim at all times fit for law universal." This
makes universality the test of moral law;
and though the formula is too abstract, and needs
to have its application expounded, it concentrates
on an essential characteristic of moral law, and
makes the destruction of the self-seeking spirit
essential to the moral life. This implies an ideal
of moral excellence in the human mind, to which,
indeed, Kant had made reference in the Critique
of Pure Reason (Transcendental Dialectic, bk. 1.,
sect. 1.), and which is treated as a grand certainty
in human knowledge, as it is the imperative
requirement of the phenomena in this way. If we
seem to help Hume, instead of refuting
him. Kant does not, however, affirm that exter-
nal things do not exist, or that there can be any
rational ground for such an affirmation; he main-
tains only that our knowledge through the sense
is knowledge of appearances under recognized
mental conditions,—an unsatisfactory theory of
external perception, however true in what it af-
irms. With this beginning, the lines of develop-
ment for the theory are fixed. When the under-
standing or reasoning power proceeds to work
up into systematized order the multifarious facts
recognized through the senses, the categories or
pure conceptions of the understanding—unity,
plurality, totality, etc.—"prescribe laws a priori
to phenomena." In this higher region, also, all
that is known is determined by phenomena and
the forms which the understanding imposes. When
we rise still higher, to contemplate the
universe as a whole, there cannot be any thing
but a further illustration of our subjection to the
forms which the mind imposes. The reason gives
us the ideas of God, the universe, and self. These
are the forms prescribed by the highest faculty
we possess; but we are not able to say more of
them than that they are forms of the reason
regulative of intellectual procedure, but not cri-
eria of the named philosophies. But in the mind;
but we have not thereby any knowledge of God,
or certainty of his existence. The argu-
ment which was all in all to Descartes was
nothing to Kant. The error appearing in Kant's
theory at the outset clings to it throughout, leave-
ing us still to seek an adequate theory of knowl-
edge. Kant leads to a sceptical result, if we are
ready to treat his intellectual scheme, developed
in the Critique of Pure Reason, as a complete
theory, and do not advance to his moral philoso-
phy or practical reason as a necessary part of it.
The direct historical result of his Critique has
been the development of a succession of transcen-
dential theories in Germany which have rapidly
worked themselves out of favor, and of a theory
of Agnosticism which has been eagerly embraced
and defended by the experiential school. See
AGNOSTICISM.

The ethical scheme of Kant may, however, be
taken as part of his theory of knowledge, and in
strict justice ought to be so regarded; in which
case it appears that the requirements of practical
life give us certainty as to the divine existence
and government, under which liberty is the birth
right of the moral agent. From pure reason he
passes over to treat of practical reason, which is
given "for the government of will, to constitute
it good." Here we become familiar with the
categorical imperative, whose formula is, "Act
from a maxim at all times fit for law universal." This
makes universality the test of moral law;
and though the formula is too abstract, and needs
to have its application expounded, it concentrates
on an essential characteristic of moral law, and
makes the destruction of the self-seeking spirit
essential to the moral life. This implies an ideal
of moral excellence in the human mind, to which,
indeed, Kant had made reference in the Critique
of Pure Reason (Transcendental Dialectic, bk. 1.,
sect. 1.), and which is treated as a grand certainty
in human knowledge, as it is the imperative
requirement of the phenomena in this way. If we
seem to help Hume, instead of refuting
him. Kant does not, however, affirm that exter-
nal things do not exist, or that there can be any
rational ground for such an affirmation; he main-
tains only that our knowledge through the sense

in which he is free from the dominion of physical law. Thus the ethical scheme is the completion of the theory of Kant, and in some sense a rectification of the whole, even while it must be admitted that a reconstruction of the intellectual side is needed, if a true harmony is to be made out.

After every deduction has been made which rigid criticism seems to require, Kant's name stands out as the most noted in the roll of modern philosophy. He is decidedly the most powerful and rigid thinker, whose work must influence the whole future of mental philosophy. Enthusiastic admirers have claimed for Hegel precedence; but all the signs of recent years are against the claim, showing that Hegel is abandoned, and that the return is upon Kant for a new start. Whatever judgment men may incline to form of the comparative merits of Kant and Hegel, moral conceptions cannot be left out of account in judging of a theory of knowledge.

LIT. — A collected edition of Kant's works was edited by Rosenkranz and Schubert, Leipzig, 1839-42, 12 vols. — English Translations. By SEMPEL: Metaphysical Ethic, Edinburg, 1839 (republished, 1869, 1870); by the same: Religion within the Boundary of Pure Reason, Edinburgh, 1838; by MEIKLEJOHN: Critique of Pure Reason, London, 1853; by ABBOTT: Theory of Ethics, London, 1873 (enlarged edition, 1879); by the same: Critique of Practical Reason, and other Works, London, 1873 (new edition, 1881); by MAX MÜLLER: Critique of Pure Reason, London, 1882, 2 vols. A translation of Kant's Anthropology appeared in Journal of Speculative Philosophy, St. Louis, vol. ix., x., xi., beginning with No. 33.— Works on Kant's Philosophy. MARAFFY: Kant's Critical Philosophy for English Readers, London, 1871; the same: Translation of Kuno Fischer's Commentary on the Critique of Pure Reason, London, 1886; MONCK: Introduction to the Critical Philosophy, Dublin, 1874; EDWARD CAID: Philosophy of Kant, London, 1877; WATSON: Kant and his English Critics, London, 1881; J. H. STIRLING: A Text-book of Kant, London, 1881; J. G. SCHURMANN: Kantian Ethics and the Ethics of Evolution, London, 1881; A. WIER: The Critical Philosophy of Kant, London, 1881; ANDREW SETH: The Development from Kant to Hegel, London, 1882; ADAMSON: Philosophy of Kant; JAMES EDMUNDS: Clavis to an Index of Kant's Ethics, Louisville, Ky., U. S. A.; W. WALLACE: Kant, London, 1882. For biography of Kant, see DE QUINCEY's translation of Wasiński's Last Days of Kant, ABBOT'S Memoir, prefixed to enlarged edition of the Theory of Ethics (1879), and J. H. W. STUCKENBERG: A Life of Kant, London, 1882. An abridgment of the Critique of Pure Reason, with notes and introduction by G. S. MORRIS, was published, Chicago, 1882.— Works upon the religious views of Kant are, PÜNNER: Die Religionslehre Kant's, Jena, 1874; F. BREDEL: La philos. de la relig. de Kant, Turin, 1874. KAPFF, Sixt Karl, the most perfect representative of the type of piety prevailing in Württemberg in the last generation; the son of a minister; b. in Göglingen, Württemberg, Oct. 22, 1805; d. in Stuttgart, Sept. 1, 1879. From earliest childhood he was religiously disposed; and at the university of Tubingen he engaged in daily prayer with his intimate friend William Hofacker. After filling the positions of vicar at Tutlingen, teacher at Hofwyl, and Dekan at Münsingen, and in 1847 at Herrenberg; in 1850 was transferred to Reutlingen, and two years afterwards to Stuttgart, where, for the remainder of his life, he was Prätlat and the greatly beloved and influential pastor of the Stiftskirche. KAPFF was a genuine Suabian, and combined the genial manners, trustfulness, and sympathetic warmth of the Suabian character. He was a friend to ministers all over Württemberg, and attracted all classes to him who had an interest in religion. As a preacher, he did not represent any sharply-defined theological or ecclesiastical tenedency. His sermons had much in them of the supernaturalism of the old Tubingen school, but more warmth and sympathy than belonged to it. He had an eye to the domestic and social wants of his people, and drew largely upon his everyday intercourse with them for his subjects. He was not eloquent, but spoke in an earnest, conversational tone, that won the heart. His influence as pastor was very great, his annual pastoral calls amounting to three thousand. He also took the warmest interest in the ecclesiastical affairs of Württemberg, and in foreign missions as advanced by the missionary institution in Basel. Thus, for more than a quarter of a century, he was the centre of the pious circles of the land.

He published quite a number of collections of sermons and smaller works. Of these the principal are, 83 Predigten u. d. alten Evangelien, Stuttgart, 3d ed., 1875 [10,000 copies]; 80 Predigten u. d. alten Episteln, 6th ed., 1880 [14,000 copies]; Communionbuch, 19th ed., 1880 [70,000 copies]; posthumously published, Casuallenden, Stuttgart, 1880, etc. See his Lebensbild, by his son CARL KAPFF, Stuttgart, 1881. BURK. KARAITE JEWS. The name "Karaite" is from the Hebrew kar "(to read)" or "recite," and denotes the radical difference of the Karaites from the Rabbinites. While the latter adhered to tradition, the former rejected the same, and strictly adhered to the letter of the Bible; hence they were called also "Textualists." The founder of Karaism was Anan, the son of David. His uncle Solomon, who was patriarch of the exiled Jews, died childless in 761 or 762 A.D.; and thus Anan was the legitimate successor to the patriarchate. He was, however, prevented from obtaining the dignity on account of his rejecting the traditions of the fathers; and his younger brother, Chanaia, was elected in his stead. Anan, not being willing to submit to such a slight, appealed to the caliph, Abujafar Almansar, who was at first disposed to favor his claim; but the rabbinic party succeeded at last, and Anan was obliged to flee. He retired to Jerusalem, where he built a synagogue, and where he soon was recognized as the legitimate prince of the captivity. The Karaites became formal, and anathemas and counter-anathemas followed. Anan's works are unfortunately lost, and his doctrinal system is only known from statements and allusions in the works of Arabic historians. His advice to his followers was to "search the Scriptures deeply." Of Christ as the founder of Christianity Anan spoke in the terms...
KARAITE JEWS.

of the highest respect. He declared Jesus of Nazareth was a very wise, just, holy, and God-fearing man, who did not at all wish to be recognized as a prophet, nor to promulgate a new religion in opposition to Judaism, but simply desired to uphold the law of Moses, and do away with the commandments of men. And Anan therefore condemns the Jews for having treated Jesus as an impostor, and for having put him to death without weighing the justice of his pretensions. (Comp. De Sacy: "Christomathie Arabe," i. 326; Wolf: "Bibl. Hebræa," p. 1086.) Anan's death is commemorated in a prayer, which his followers offer up for him every sabbath to the present day. After his death (765-780) his son Saul was elected, who was succeeded by Benjamin ben Moses Nahavendi (about 800-820), the greatest luminary among the Karaites. He introduced many reforms amongst his co-religionists, which were so highly appreciated by the followers of Anan, that they deserted the name Ananites, and henceforth called themselves Karaites, i.e., Scripturists, or Ezra and Bothe Milra, followers of the Bible, in contradistinction to Baale Ha-kabala, or followers of tradition.

After Nahavendi, the next conspicuous Karaite was Daniel ben Moses el-Kumassi (820-860). We may also mention Eldad ha-Dani (about 880-900), the famous traveler; Chawi-el-Balchi, the Karaite freethinker and first rationalistic critic of the Bible, who flourished after 880. About the year 900, Karaism was finally fixed, both in its opposition to Rabbinism and in the fundamental articles of faith by which its followers demand to be judged. These articles are thus expressed in their confession of faith as translated by Rule:

"1. That all this bodily (or material) existence, that is to say, the spheres and all that is in them, is created; 2. That they have a Creator, and the Creator has his own soul (or spirit); 3. That he has no similitude, and he is one, separate from all; 4. That he sent Moses, our master (upon whom be peace!); 5. That he sent with Moses, our master, his law, which is perfect; 6. For the instruction of the faithful, the language of our law, and the interpretation, or reading (or text) and the division (or vowel-pointing); 7. That the blessed God sent forth the other prophets; 8. That God (blessed be his name) will raise the sons of men to God sent forth the other prophets; 9. That the blessed God gave to men according to his ways and according to the fruit of his doings; 10. That the blessed God has not reprobad the men of the captivity, but has comforted them in their miseries; 11. That they have a Creator, and the language of our law, and the interpretation, or reading (or text) and the division (or vowel-pointing); 12. That the blessed God gave to men according to his ways and according to the fruit of his doings; 13. That he sent Moses, our master (upon whom be peace!); 14. That the blessed God has not reprobad the men of the captivity, but has comforted them in their miseries."
in 1556, he was removed to Ansbach as pastor and superintendent-general. Once more, however, he fell into error. He set forth some curious and erroneous views during his life on earth, and these views caused much confusion and strife. He was suspended, but retracted, and was restored. He wrote a catechism, which was in use in Ansbach in the beginning of the 18th century; and travelled through Germany, Switzerland, and Italy with his pupils; lived then from 1797 to 1809 in the house of the Princess Gallitzin; and was in 1809 appointed professor of church history at the university of Jena. His principal work is his Church History, of which the introductory volume appeared at Münster, 1819, the five following (to 1153) between 1823 and 1834. He also published Denkwürdigkeiten aus d. Leben d. Fürstt Amalia von Gallitzin, Münster, 1828.

Kautz, Jakob (Cecius), b. at Bockenheim about 1500; settled at Worms as Reformed preacher in 1524, but came soon in conflict, not only with the Roman-Catholic clergy, but also with his colleagues of the Evangelical Church; they sympathized with Wittenberg, and he with Strasburg. He openly joined Denck and Haet in 1524; and June 9, 1527, he published a number of Anabaptist theses as a challenge to the Lutheran preachers. The dispute did probably not take place. The magistrate interfered, and Kautz was expelled from the city. From that moment he was a fugitive, wandering Anabaptist preacher to the last, lucid in thought, vivid in diction, harmonious in their pensive melody. Many of the poems, "are faultless after their kind, flowing from the first verse to the last, lucid in thought, vivid in diction, harmonious in their pensive melody." Many of the originals of the poems were written on the backs and edges of letters, in old account-books and pocket-books. The first edition was five hundred copies. Between 1827 and 1873, when the copyright expired, a hundred and forty editions appeared, and 305,500 copies were sold. During the following five years the original publishers alone sold 70,000 copies. In 1827 another volume of sacred lyrics entitled Lyra Innocentium, a collection of poems for childhood, its weaknesses, troubles, temptations, religious privileges. Mr. Keble's most important literary work was the edition of the Works of Richard Hooker, which he prepared at the request of the University Press, and which, after six years of labor, appeared at Oxford in 1838. It is justly
considered the best edition of Hooker. Several of Keble’s hymns have been introduced into English hymn-books, of which the best are "O God of mercy, God of might," and the devout and restful evening song, "Sun of my soul, thou Saviour dear," taken from the second poem in the Christian Year, entitled "Evening."

Mr. Keble adopted very high views on the sacraments and the apostolical constitution of the Church. He held to the doctrine of the apostolical succession, the high sacramental view of the Lord’s Supper, and the usefulness of the confessional, which he regretted that circumstances did not justify him in introducing into his own church. At Oxford he was a close and intimate friend of Newman, Pusey, and Hurrell Froude, who had once been his pupil. With him and several others, the notion started of issuing brief and pointed tracts promulgating High-Church principles, and raising the standard of piety in the Church. The result was the so-called Tracts for the Times, which reached the number of ninety, created a profound impression in England, and the studies spent in the preparation of which, or the stimulus of them, led to the defection to the Roman-Catholic communion of Newman, and others of the best spirits of the Church of England. Keble himself wrote eight of the series, Nos. 4, 18, 40, 52, 54, 67, 80, 89; the first (No. 4) being on apostolical succession. On July 14, 1833, he preached a sermon, in Oxford, on National Apostasy, the occasion of which was the suppression of ten Irish bishoprics, and which Cardinal Newman heard with the deepest interest, and has characterized as the starting-point for the Romendaway. Mr. Keble saw Dr. Newman’s famous tract, No. 90, before it was published, and approved of it; but, though much dissatisfied with the state of the English Church, he did not leave its communion, and regarded the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception (1854) as an insuperable barrier to ecclesiastical union. He was not eloquent as a preacher, but scriptural and philosophical; fell into two great divisions,—theoretical and practical theology. ALEX. SCHWEIZER.

KÉDRON, or KIDRON, a small stream which rises a mile and a half north-west of Jerusalem, strikes the north-eastern corner of the wall of the city, forms a deep gorge in the Valley of Jehoshaphat, between Mount Moriah and Mount Olivet, cuts its way through the Wilderness of Judah, and finally empties itself into the Dead Sea. Its name, from a Hebrew root which signifies "gloom," probably refers to the gloom of the surroundings, deepened by various historical associations (1 Kings xiv. 13; 2 Kings xi. 16; 2 Chron. xv. 16, xxx. 16, xxx. 14). In the New Testament it is mentioned (Mark xvi. 26; Luke xxii. 39; John xvi. 11; Christ crossing it on his way to Gethsemane.

KEIL, Karl August Gottlieb, b. at Grossenheim, Saxony, April 23, 1754; d. in Leipzig, April 22, 1818; studied theology at Leipzig, and was appointed professor there, of philosophy, in 1785, and of theology in 1787. As an exegete he tried to combine the historical principle of Semler with the grammatical principle of Ernesti. His views he has set forth in his Hermeneutik des Neuen Testament (Leipzig, 1810), translated into Latin by Emmering (1812). His minor treatises, relating to the exegesis of the New Testament, appeared at Leipzig, in 1820, under the title Opuscula Academica.

KEIM, Carl Theodor, D.D., b. at Stuttgart, Dec. 17, 1825; d. at Giessen, Nov. 17, 1875. He studied at Maulbronn and at the universities of Tübingen (where he came under Baur’s influence), and Bonn (1843–47); was tutor of Count Sontheim (1848–50); Repentat Tii in the field of ethics this distinction became of paramount importance. Ethics, together with politics, he treated as the practical division of philosophy, though without denying that there might be a Christian ethics, just as there was a philosophical ethics; since theology, like philosophy, fell into two great divisions,—theoretical and practical theology. ALEX. SCHWEIZER.
resignation, in the corresponding position at Giessen. Keim's life was, on the whole, sad. He was an invalid; and he chafed under the comparative obscurity of his academic position, for he felt himself fitted for a higher post. His theological standpoint may have hindered his promotion; for, while a rationalist, he was singularly candid and moderate, so that he pleased neither the orthodox nor the radicals. From 1851 he was professor of ecclesiastical history at Ziirich, and his spirituality. But he was essentially an his
delightful to him; and the way in which he per
formed his work invoked both his earnestness and
his spirituality. But he was essentially an histori
an eloquent and edifying preacher,—were
during this period he produced his masterly vol
umes: Die Reformation der Reichstadt Ulm (Stutt
gart, 1851), Schotten Reformationsgeschichte bis
die Augsburger Reichstag (Tubingen, 1855), Am
brosius Blairer (Stuttgart, 1860), Ref ormationsblatter
der Reichstadt Esslingen (Esslingen, 1860). When
he accepted the chair of theology at Ziirich, he
turned his energies into another part of the field
of church history. Henceforth, to his death, he
studied the beginnings of Christianity, and it was
in this department he won his universal fame.
He chose as the theme of his inaugural (Dec. 17,
1860) Die menschliche Entwicklung Jesu Christi
(The Human Development of Jesus Christ),
Ziirich, 1861. The address raised high expectations. It
was evident Keim had a message. Die geschichtliche
Würde Jesu (The Historical Dignity of Jesus),
Ziirich, 1864, came next. He then republished the
two just named, with a new lecture, under the
caption, Der geschichtliche Christus (The His
torical Christ), Ziirich, 1865, 3d ed., 1866. At
least came the first installment of the great work,
for which scholars had impatiently waited: Die
Geschichte Jesu von Nazaret in ihrer Verke
tung mit dem Gesammtleben seines Volkes, Zürich, 1867-72,
3 vols.; English translation, Jesus of Nazareth, and
the National Life of Israel, London, 1873-82, 6 vols.
Nothing like it had hitherto appeared. Immense
learning, tireless energy, nervous force, deep convictions, cautious judgment, reverence,
these united to give the work a lasting importan
t. It was, and remains, the Life of Jesus from the
realistic standpoint. In order to give his views a wider currency, Keim published Die
Geschichte Jesu nach den Ergebnissen heutiger Wis
senschaft für weitere Kreise übersichtlich erzählt (The
History of Jesus in the Light of the most Recent
Researches, told in condensed form for General
Circulation), Ziirich, 1878, 2d ed., 1875. In this
latter work Keim altered his position upon some
points. In the second edition he made impor
tant additions particularly of a critical Appen
dix. His last work was Aus dem Urchristenthum,
Geschichtliche Untersuchungen in zwangloser Folge
(Miscellaneous Essays upon Points connected with
Primitive Christianity), Ziirich, 1878. Only one
volume has appeared up to this time (1892).
Besides these, he issued an important essay upon
the edicts of tolerance of Christianity issued by
Roman emperors (Die römischen Toleranzdec
den, Berlin, 1851-54), and an elaborate
Geschichtlicher Werth, in the “Theologische Jahrbücher,” 1852,
in which he prepared the way for the final explo
sion of the idea, accepted by Origen, and by Keim, Neander, and others, that there were three edicts of tolera
while as a matter of fact there were only
two. See Mason: The Persecution of Diocletian,
pp. 327, 328. Keim also wrote on the conversion
of Constantine, Der Ubertritt Konstantins des
Grossen, Ziirich, 1862; and on Celsus, Wahres Wort,
Ziirich, 1873 (a reproduction, by piecing together
Origen’s quotations of Celsus’ attack upon Chris
tianity, to which Origen replied, and an elaborate
and ingenious study of the same). After his
death, H. Ziegler, his literary executor, care
fully edited and carried through the press another
book found among his papers, Rom und das Chris
tenthum, Berlin, 1881. This last volume was
written by Keim during 1855 and 1860, but, owing
probably to his change of occupation, never fin
ished. It is a masterly analysis of the conditions
under which Christianity took its rise, and a clear
and engrossing sketch of its early struggles with
Paganism.

Keim was an intense man. He threw his whole
soul into whatever he took up. In his student
days he studied, with great zeal, Oriental lan
guages under Ewald, and then philosophy under
Reiff. When he turned from Reformations studies
to early church history, he turned completely
Theologically he belonged to the school of Baur:
but he was no blind follower of the great master;
rather a fearless, independent student. Therefore
he gave up such positions as he had satisfied
himself were untenable. In his great book upon
the life of Christ, he put opposite to Paul, upon
whom the Tubingen school dwelt so forcibly, the
majestic figure of Christ; and, while agreeing in
the main with their conclusions, he emphasized
the paramount importance of the Master. He
unfortunately rejected the fourth Gospel, and
minimized the miraculous element; but he refused
the hypothesis of a vision, and assumed releva
tions of the glorified Lord to his disciples to ex
plain the story of the resurrection; and, compelled
by his fairness, admitted the superhuman characte
r of Christ, saying, “The person of Jesus is not
only a phenomenon among the many phenomena
of God, it is a special work of God, the crown of
all the divine revelations.” He calls Jesus “the
sinless one, the Son of God,” and says he “makes
the impression of a superhuman miracle.”

Keim never married. His sister kept house for
him, and he had a canary bird and a cat to keep
him company. His style of composition is a fai
quent subject of complaint. He endeavored to
say too much in a single sentence. His hand
writing was almost illegible. (See the sketch of
his life by H. Ziegler, prefixed to Rom und das
Christenthum, from which this article is mainly
taken.)

KEITH, Alexander, D.D., author of several
works on prophecy, b. at Keith Hall, Aberdeen
shire, Scotland, 1791; d. in Buxton, Feb. 7, 1880;
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and ordained minister of the parish of St. Cyrus, Kincardineshire, in 1816. In 1824 he published in Edinburgh, where his subsequent books also appeared, his first work, Evidence of the Truth of the Christian Religion, derived from the Literal Fulfilment of Prophecy. The book had a great run, nearly forty editions having been printed in the author's lifetime. Its most original feature was the use it made of the testimony of modern travellers as to the present condition of Palestine and other Bible countries, the truth of the prophecies being unconsciously attested by them. At various times Dr. Keith followed up this work by The Signs of the Times (1832, 2 vols., 5th ed. 1847), an exposition of symbolical prophecies in Daniel and Revelation), Demonstration of the Truth of Christianity (1838), The Land of Israel (1843), The Harmony of Prophecy (1851), History and Destiny of the World and of the Church (1861), Reply to Elliot's Horse Apocalypse, Reply to Stanley's Remarks on Prophecy, etc., in his Times and Palestine. In 1860 Dr. Keith, with Dr. Black of Aberdeen, Rev. R. M. McCheyne, and Rev. Andrew Bonar, went out to Palestine, Eastern Europe, etc., by appointment of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, on a mission of inquiry as to the state of the Jews preparatory to the establishment of a mission among them. In 1843, on the occurrence of the disruption, he gave up his connection with the Establishment, and helped to found the Free Church of Scotland. For a number of years he was convener of the committee for the conversion of the Jews. Though he lived to a great age, he was always somewhat of an invalid, and at a comparatively early period he retired from active service in the ministry, and devoted himself to literary work.

W. G. BLAIKIE.

KEITH, George, a distinguished Quaker, who, in the latter period of his life, joined the Church of England; b. in Aberdeen, Scotland, about 1640; d. in Edburton, Sussex, about 1714. He was designed for the Presbyterian ministry, but adopted the principles of the Quakers about 1664. He suffered imprisonment for preaching in England, and emigrated to America, where he was surveyor-general in New Jersey, 1685–88, and taught a school in Philadelphia, 1889. He travelled in New England, and defended the principles of the Quakers against Increase and Cotton Mather. Returning to Philadelphia, he became involved in a controversy with his own sect, chiefly upon the atonement. He also accused the Friends of being infected with deistic notions. Returning to England, he met Penn himself, who, on hearing one of his sermons on the atonement, rose in his seat, and pronounced him an apostate. Keith was condemned by the Annual Meeting, but formed a body of his own, known as the "Christian Quakers," or "Keithians." Still restless, he united with the Church of England, and was sent out to America as a missionary. In 1706 he returned to England, and was settled at Edburton, where he died. Burnet, in his History of our own Times, says that Keith "was esteemed the most learned man that ever was in that sect, and was well versed in the Oriental tongues, philosophy, and mathematics." He engaged in a controversy with Robert Barclay, against whom he wrote his principal work, The Standard of the Quakers examined; or, an Answer to the Apology of Robert Barclay, London, 1702. In this work he tries to prove the seemingly "improvable bulwark" of Barclay "defective, unsound, and erroneous," and considers a variety of subjects, from immediate revelation and man's fall, to recreations, oaths, and defensive war. See JANNEY'S History of the Friends, Philadelphia, 1867.

KELLY, Thomas, the author of some excellent hymns; b. near Athy, in Queen's County, Ireland, 1708; d. May 14, 1855. Graduating with honor at Dublin University, he devoted himself to the study of law, in London, until, his mind being aroused on the subject of religion, he consecrated himself to the ministry, and was ordained in the Established Church in 1732. His preaching was more fervid and evangelical in character than was usual at that day. He was encouraged by the visit of Rowland Hill to Ireland, in 1733, to preserve this style, but was, after a time, inhibited, by the archbishop of Dublin, from preaching in the diocese. He then began preaching in dissenting chapels in Dublin, soon became a dissenter himself, and from his ample means built a number of Congregational churches at Athy, Wexford, Waterford, etc. In 1804 Mr. Kelly published a volume of ninety-six Hymns on Various Passages of Scripture. In subsequent editions (7th ed., Dublin, 1853) the number was greatly increased. Mr. Kelly's best hymns are "On the mountain-tops appearing," and "We sing the praise of Him who died," which is distinguished by fervor and strong Christian confidence.

KELTIC CHURCH. This title may be said to apply primarily to the early Christian communities among the aboriginal tribes of Great Britain and Ireland,—the Britons, the Picts, and the Scott, or Irish,—as well as among the kindred tribes of Brittany and Gallicia. Notwithstanding many feuds, they were bound together by affinities of race and language, and by certain customs and peculiarities of church organization to which they tenaciously clung long after they had been abandoned elsewhere. Secondary the term may be held to embrace those missions among other nationalities—Saxon, Frank, Burgundian, German, Swiss, and Lombard—which originated in the zealous and self-denying labors of Keltic missionaries from Ireland or Iona.

The history of the Keltic Church has been appropriately divided into three periods: (1) The period of its rise and growth in the countries which were its home, extending from the third to the fifth century, (2) That of its full maturity...
of Christian life and culture at home, and of missionary activity abroad, extending from the sixth to the eighth century; (3) that of its gradual decay or violent suppression from the ninth to the twelfth century. It will be evident, that, in the compass of this article, we can give only the barest outline of the history, and but the briefest account of the doctrine, ritual, and organization, of the Keltic Church.

A. History. I. Period of Rise and Growth in the Countries which were its Home.

1. South Britain.—When and how Christianity was first introduced into Britain is a question we cannot fail to ask, and one to which as yet we must be content without a very definite answer. But the little we know of British Christianity in pre-Saxon times—of the doctrine, rites, and constitution of the Church—seems rather to favor the idea of its origin from, and close connection with, the half-Oriental, half-Keltic churches of Gaul than more directly with the Church of Rome, or, as was once supposed, that of Asia Minor. It is only at the close of the second century, or beginning of the third, that we reach firm standing-ground in the brief but significant statement of Tertullian: "Britannorum inaccesa Romanis loca Christo vero subdita." This is a very significant testimony, even if we translate, as we probably should, not the places, but only indefinitely places, i.e., some places of the Britons inaccessible to the Romans, but subdued to Christ; and shows that the soldiers of the cross, even at that early date, had succeeded in extending the Master's sway beyond the limits which the Roman legions had reached, or at least had been able to hold in permanent subjection. Hardly less significant is the testimony of Origen, that there were those in Britain who believed in the name of the Saviour, and with joy called upon the Lord; and its significance is not diminished by his further statement, that there were still very many in Britain and other distant lands, who had not heard the word of the gospel. The triumphs of the cross were still very limited in those regions; but there were certainly Christians who believed in the one God, and in our Lord Jesus Christ, and, perhaps, meetings of Christians who worshipped with joy the Father and the Son. True, they may have continued for a time but a "feeble folk," not many wise, not many noble, may have been called, whose names would have been blazoned while they lived, or graven in brass or stone when they died. But, through the whole of the third century, there were those in Britain who in truth gave themselves to Christ, and did not dishonor his name, and who, when the day of trial came, proved faithful unto death. "This was in the Diocletian persecution, the longest and bloodiest the Christian Church had endured, during which Gildas, the native historian, speaking somewhat vaguely, tells us, "The whole Church underwent execution, and charging bravely through an ill-natured and inhospitable world, marched, as it were, in whole troops to heaven." Some maintain that he should have excepted his own country and Gaul from the range of the persecution; but the latter part of the passage shows that he held his shield over the earliest, and shows that he was neither so ignorant nor so credulous as some have imagined him to be. "Some doubt," says Mr. Mason, in his historical essay on the Diocletian persecution, "has been entertained on the question whether Constantius did not hinder the persecution from being universal by refusing to take any part in the work at all. It is difficult to discover how far Constantius really participated in the persecution; but that he did so is plain, not only from the fact that the edicts were now the law of the empire, to which he must needs conform, but also because some positive statements in the Acts of St. Crispina prove, that, in Maximian's part of the empire, the name of the Caesar, Constantius, was officially quoted as countenancing the promulgation of the edict. Even the second edict, ordering the arrest of the clergy, must have been promulgated by Constantius; for, that, at least, is needed to explain the one circumstantially related martyrdom of that time to which the British Church can lay claim." This is that of Alban, commonly accounted the proto-martyr of Britain.

From the cessation of the persecution we may date a more flourishing era of the British Church. It increased considerably in numbers, and was more fully organized; though it was yet far from fulfilling its mission, and gathering into its fold the majority of the British tribes. Three of its bishops (those of London, York, and of Colonia Londinensium, which some identify with Chester, others with Lincoln or Caerleon) are registered among those who attended the synod of Arles held in 314, and are held as assenting to certain canons not in harmony with the later usages of the Keltic Church. It is possible that some of them were present at the Council of Sardica in 347; it is certain that some were at the synod of Ariminum in 356, and that three of them were so poor as to be obliged to accept the allowance offered by the emperor to defray their expenses. They were as yet, in all probability, like the Gallic and African bishops,—but the pastors of single congregations, or of a small circle of congregations.

The British churches and their bishops, like most of those in the West, sided, with Athanasius and the Council of Nicea, against Arius; though, like many others, they were more concerned about the substance of the faith than about the particular terms used to express it. This gave occasion to Hilary to say, "The pastors of Gaul and Germany, to take care, not only that they were orthodox in the substance of their belief, but also that they were in agreement with the Council of Nicea as to the terms in which they expressed it. But, though the general orthodoxy of the British churches and their pastors is unquestionably established by the statements of Athanasius and Hilary, it seems to me that they push these state-
ments too far who seek, on the ground of them, to cast discredit on the testimony of the native historians. Indeed, as Bede and others admit, it was not in Britain, however, that he first professed his errors; but after he had vented his indignation, he was not in Britain, however, that he first professed his errors; but after he had vented his indignation, he had been refuted and condemned there, and had been banished from the district before the close of the previous century. The various dedications of churches, etc., to Patrick in the district, seem, according to Keltic usage, to show that he had labored there, as well as in Ireland. Two who did much for the continuance or revival of his work in Ireland are said to have been born in Cumbria; viz., Mochta, or Machutus, and Gildas.

3. Ireland.—This was the earliest home of Christian parents soon after the middle of the fourth century. After such training as he could get at home, he is said to have gone to one or more of the great centers of Christian thought and life; and, if his visit to Rome is somewhat doubtful, his training under St. Martin of Tours is more unquestioned. From him he probably received his mission, and had that enthusiasm which was to fit him for it kindled or quickened. To him he dedicated the stone church, which, with the help of masons from Gaul, he built at Candida Casa, or Whithorn. Like him, he not only acted as bishop of the region, but became the head of a great monastic school. By his missionary labors he spread the gospel among the inhabitants of Galloway and Strathclyde, as well as among the Picts between the Grampian Mountains and the Firth of Forth. No doubt his work was, to a large extent, but temporary and partial; so that St. Patrick, soon after his death, could speak of the Picts as apostates. Still the memory of it lived, and gave an advantage to the work of St. Columba, whose followers, as well as those of Columbus, brought Christianity to the surrounding tribes and from Ireland were trained in Christian living, and stimulated to active Christian work, and in due time largely helped on the revival of religion in Ireland, as in Scotland.

4. Ireland.—This was the earliest home of the Scoti, and is, undoubtedly, the Scotland of the earlier middle ages. Christianity is supposed to have come to it from France, with which there was perhaps close intercourse during the third and fourth centuries; but, if it met with any success, it must have been of a very limited kind. Celestius, the companion of Pelagius, is supposed by some to have been of Scotic, i.e., Irish origin, and is said to have kept up correspondence with the land of his birth after he left it. Under the year 491—the year of the famous Council of Ephesus—we read in the Chronicon of Proser of Aquitaine, "Ad Scottos in Christum credentes.
Ordinatur a Papa Celestino Palladius et primus episcopus mitterit." There were, then, already Scots who believed in Christ; and, according to the Irish legends, Palladius was not, though greatly to enlarge their number, and after a short time he left the country, and died in the land of the Picts. The Scottish legend is, that he lived there for many years, and carried on his mission with more success than in Ireland. The true apostle of Ireland was that Patricius to whom we have already referred as born near Dumbarton, in the kingdom of Strathclyde, who, being carried captive in his youth to Ireland, served there for six years as a slave, and who, after a second and very brief captivity, felt an inward call to devote himself to the work of converting the barbarous tribes among whom his lot, when a slave, had been cast. Some suppose that he had begun his missionary work before Palladius set foot in the country; others, that he only began it after Palladius had retired from it in despair. If there is much that is legendary and untrustworthy in the accounts that have come down to us regarding him, there can be little doubt that he began his work about that time, and that he prosecuted it with great perseverance, and with a large amount of success. According to the old Irish tradition, the saints of the first order were all bishops. St. Patrick is said to have ordained three hundred and fifty or three hundred and sixty-five of them, and to have founded as many churches. They were, therefore, of a very humble grade,—such village or tribal bishops as were to be found in Celtic Britain, and such they appear to have continued to a comparatively late date in Ireland. Two writings attributed to St. Patrick have been preserved,—his Confessio and his Epistola ad Coroticum; the former of which is certainly, and the latter is probably, genuine. Both exhibit him as a humble, simple-minded, self-denying, and devoted Christian missionary, holding by the great truths generally held by the worthies of the ancient church, and apparently unacquainted with, or averse to, several erroneous opinions which were coming into favor elsewhere. The hymn attributed to him, and translated in Dr. Todd’s life of the saint, shows that, to some extent, superstitious notions still mingled with his simple faith. Neither the style nor the contents of his confessio are in harmony with the opinions that he spent several years in Rome, or sought or got any confirmation of his mission from there.

II. PERIOD OF REVIVED CHRISTIAN LIFE AT HOME, AND OF MISSIONARY ACTIVITY ABROAD.

The clergy of the earlier period, even in Ireland, seem to have been mainly a secular clergy, and had to deal with people scattered among their heathen kindred, and in strict subjection to their secular chiefs. Missionary institutions, so far as they were present at all, formed but a subordinate feature in the Church of that time. But in this second period, and under the second order of saints, these institutions held a more important place in Wales and Ireland, and in Scotland became the most distinctive feature of the Church. These houses, with their dependent missionary colonies, may be said to have constituted the Church. These houses, however, were rather missionary institutes, like those of the Moravians, for the conversion of surrounding tribes, and the training and protection of the converts, than monasteries in the later sense. Whence the new life and organization came,— whether from the magnum monasterium of Ninian at Whithorn, or from the source from which the founder of that monastery had got it,—the monastery at Tours, or from some affiliated institution in Brittany, or whether, as Gildas says, it was the deep penitence of the Britons under the terrible chastisements they suffered at the hands of the Saxon invaders—it were not easy now to determine. All we know with certainty is, that, in the sixth century, it specially manifested itself in the monastic schools of Wales, was conveyed from them to Ireland through Finnian of Clonard, and from Ireland was brought back in intensified form to Scotland. This century, Bishop Forbes tells us, in his Introduction to the Life of St. Kenetigern, “was, in Wales, a century of national life, of religious and mental activity. It was the age of Sts. David, Illutus, Samson, and Teilo;” it sent missionaries to Ireland and to Brittany. Indeed, Brittany, which had suffered from various invaders almost as severely as England itself, was to a large extent repeopled from Britain. It was at this epoch that the celebrated monastic college of Bangor——Iscoed on the Dee—was founded. It was from the Welsh saints, especially David, Gildas, and Cadoc, that the impulse to the new movement in Ireland came. The traditions as to the second order of Irish saints, almost all of whom were presbyters and monks, point to a great revival and spread of religion through a new and living agency based on monastic institutions, in which the population which gathered round the more strictly ecclesiastical nucleus, separated from heathen relations, and freed from the arbitrary control of secular chieftains, could be more fully instructed in Christian truth, the practices of Christian devotion, and the two succeeding centuries are spoken of as the “golden age of Ireland,” when, within these monastic sanctuaries at least, there was contentment, prosperity, zealous study, and earnest Christian life; when they were the resort of students from Britain and the continent of Europe; and when the land was known as the “home of learning,” as well as the “island of saints.” This mission-work was especially carried on by twelve of Finnian’s disciples, who covered their native land with such institutions, and became known as the “twelve apostles of Ireland.” Two of the band were, like their master, descended from the Irish Picts; and one of them, at least, found scope for his missionary activity among the Picts of Scotland, as well as among their brethren in Ireland. But the chief of all the twelve was Columba, who united in himself the training of both the great monastic schools, having been the pupil of Finnian of Moville, who had the monastery of Whithorn, as well as of Finnian of Clonard, who had the training of the Welsh school. The details
of his romantic career and marvellous success are given in the article on Columba (vol. i. pp. 515, 546), and need not here be repeated. The work begun by him and his twelve companions at Iona was carried on by their successors till all Pictland and the Scotic kingdom of Dalriada, as well as part of their native country, were covered with institutions subject to the mother-house of Iona and its presbytery, the court of Columba; and evangelists were sent on missions to many of the outlying islands, and to the great Anglican kingdom of Northumbria.

It is said to have been but a few years before the death of Columba, that the last of the British bishops in England abandoned their sees, and, with the remnant of their flocks, sought refuge from the cruel oppression of their heathen invaders in the mountain fastnesses of the west and south, which yet remained in the hands of their kindred. It was in the very year of Columba's death, that Augustine and his companions— the missioners of Gregory I.—commenced in Kent their mission for the conversion of the Saxons and made various but fruitless efforts to bring the British Church to adopt their usages, and aid their work. Their labors, at first, proving too stem to gain the rude Angles, they thereupon retired from England; but several of his and of Aidan’s pupils remained, and, while conforming in these external things to the new régime, continued with vigor their evangelistic work. In the course of the sixth century many earnest and able men went forth from the Scoto-Irish monasteries to labor as missionaries on the continent of Europe, and win over to Christianity, or the trinitarian form of it, the Teutonic tribes who had broken up and overspread the western part of the Roman Empire.

Chief among these, towards the close of the century, was Columbanus, or Columba, jun., the pupil of Comghall and Finnian of Clonard. Setting out, like his elder namesake, with twelve companions, he attempted to carry the gospel to some of the heathen tribes in England. Meeting with no success among them, he passed on to the Continent, and settled first in Burgundy, at Luxovium, or Luxeuil. There, amidst the forests, he constructed a monastery in Scotic form, which soon became famous as a nursery of piety, a centre of Nicene orthodoxy, and a school for the training of Christian youth. Two other institutions of a similar character were set up in the surrounding forests, and occupied by the disciples, remaining, according to the custom of his native land, subject to his jurisdiction. He and his disciples soon succeeded in gaining the confidence of the people among whom they had settled; but their popularity at length roused the jealousy of the native clergy who had resided in that part of Gaul after it passed into the hands of the Burgundians. In particular, their adherence to the custom of the Irish Church, as to the time of observing the Easter festival, and their claim to a separate organization, exposed them to much trouble. Columbanus wrote boldly in defence of his views, both to Gregory I. and to one of his successors. He wrote in similar terms to a French synod, assembled to determine the matter in dispute, resolutely contending for the custom of his own church, and earnestly
pleading to be allowed "to live quietly in those
woods, beside the bones of his seventeen departed
brethren," as hitherto. By his stern faithfulness in
obeying the teaching on the Continent or Thierry, he also incurred the displeasure of
that Burgundian monarch, and was ordered to
leave the kingdom. After laboring for a short
time in various German cities on the banks of
the Rhine, he made his way into Switzerland,
where he was successful in reclaiming many who
had relapsed into Paganism. He preached the
gospel on the shores of Lake Constance and in
the Rhaetian territory; and leaving behind him
Gallus, the disciple whose name has been perma-
nently associated with the district, to complete
his work, he passed over the Alps into Italy. By
permission of the king of the Lombards, he
settled in his dominions, and raised at Bobbio
that monastery which was to preserve to future
generations his name and fame, and many of his
writings. It is to these writings that Dr. Ebrard
is mainly indebted for the account he has given
of the teaching of the Columban missionaries,
and they certainly present it in its most favorable
aspect. Columbanus died in 615.

Under Theodoric's successor, the monastery
of Luxovium revived, and became the mother of
a considerable number of similar institutions in
various parts of France. Eustasius, who presided
over it, also carried the gospel to Bavaria; Killian,
to Thuringia; Fiacre, Fursy, Ultan, and others,
to various parts of France, Belgium, etc. Less
known Irish missionaries in the eighth century
introduced Christianity into the Faroe Islands,
even into Iceland. Thus, between the fifth
and eighth centuries, the Keltic Church extended
with intermissions, north and south from Iceland
to Spain, east and west from the Atlantic to the
Danube, from westernmost Ireland to the Italian
Bobbio and the German Salzburg,—catholic in
doctrine and practice, and yet with its claims to
catholicity ignored or impugned; with a long roll
of saints, every name of note on which is either
that of one, like Columbanus, taking a line wholly
independent of Rome; or, like Colman at the
synod of Whitby, directly in collision with her;
having its own liturgy, its own translation of the
Bible, its own mode of chanting, its own monastic
rule, its own cycle for the calculation of Easter,
and presenting both internal and external evi-
dence of a complete autonomy. "It brought
religion straight home to men's hearts by sheer
power of love and self-sacrifice. It held up before
them, in the unconscious goodness and nobleness
of its representatives, the moral evidence of Chris-
tianity, and made them feel what it was to be
taught and cared for in the life spiritual by pas-
tors, who, before all things, were the disciples and
ministers of Christ" (like Aidan, Colum-
banus, and Gallus).

III. Periods of Gradual Decay or Vio-
lation of Constitution. — As already stated, the
Columban Church of Northumbria was required by
Oswy, in 684, to conform to certain customs of
the Roman Church. Bishop Colman and some of
his clergy, who refused to do so, returned to
their native country. Others, who complied, were
allowed to remain; and Columbanus, by the statement
of Gallus, a ceremony which implied that their Scotch
ordination was imperfect. Wilfrid, who had been
the chief advocate of Roman usages at Whitby,
was promoted to the vacant bishopric; and, de-
clining to own the mission of the Scotch prelates,
he sought and obtained consecration on the Con-
tinent. The British churches in Wales did not
conform to the Roman rule for determining the
Easter festival till a century after the synod of
Whitby, nor were they brought fully under the
English metropolitan see till the twelfth century.
The churches of Devonshire and Cornwall con-
formed to the Roman Easter about the beginning
of the eighth century, but were not completely
brought under the archbishop of Canterbury till
the Norman times. The see of St. Ninian at
Whithorn was revived by the Saxons when mas-
ters of that part of North Britain, and continued
for several centuries to be subject to the arch-
episcopal see of York. The see of St. Kentigern,
by persuasion of Adamnan, conformed to the
Roman usages in 688, and for a time also was
brought into subjection to the see of York. Nech-
tan, the imperious king of the Picts, who turned
the tide of Saxon conquest in Scotland, on the
suggestion of Saxon or Irish emissaries, required
his clergy to conform to the Roman customs. But
part of them, if they yielded for a time, did so
against their convictions: and in 717 he took the
strong step of expelling from his dominions the
Scotic monks, or "family of Hii, or Hy." They
were not restored to their old foundations till the
time of Kenneth Mac Alpin; and immigrants were
brought from various quarters to supply their
places, some from Saxon England, more from
the south of Ireland. These were disciples of the
third order of Irish saints, and are supposed to
have been mainly Culdees. (See art. on Cul-
dees, vol. i pp. 579-581.) The Church of South
Ireland accepted the Roman reckoning of the
Easter festival in 634, that of North Ireland
about 710; but no doubt there continued for a
time, in several of the smaller monasteries, adher-
ents of the older custom. Iona is said to have
conformed in 717: but in 729 Mr. Skene tells us
but one festival is mentioned on which the new
custom had been observed; and till 771 it is said
there was a schism in the island,—rival abbots,
and probably rival celebrations of the festival.
The final extinction of the old Keltic Church, both
in Scotland and Ireland, was due, in part at least,
to internal decay, and was not completed till the
close of the eleventh century, under St. Margaret
in Scotland and St. Malachi in Ireland. The
Keltic bishopric in Gallicia seems to have been
brought into conformity with the Church of Spain
in the seventh century. The peculiar usages of
the Church in Brittany were not abandoned till
the ninth century, nor was it till the close of the
twelfth century that it was finally brought under
the archbishopric of Tours. The suppression of
the Keltic Church in Germany was brought about
mainly through the labors of the Anglo-Saxon
Winfred, or St. Boniface, and in the first half of
the eighth century.

B. Doctrine, Ritual, and Constitution. 1. Doc-
trine of Keltic Church. — The general orthodoxy
of its great teachers is shown by the professions
of faith contained in the writings of St. Patrick
and Columbanus, by the statement of Gallus,
Bede, and others in early times, and the acknowl-
edgments of Montalembert and other Roman
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"Catholics" in our own time. In the controversy as to the "Tria Capitula" in connection with the fifth general council, Baronius admits that the Irish Church took a different view from that of Rome. But what mainly separated it and the British churches, in the second period of their history, from the Church of Rome, was the difference of their usages. Of the Easter festival, the tonsure, etc., their claim to independence in their own lands, and assertion of the right to send missionaries elsewhere without authority from Rome. Ebrard and some others seem still to regard them as a sort of premature protestants. We think it would be nearer the truth to say, that, as the twilight lasts so much longer in these northern regions, so also the afterglow of the primitive day was lengthened out there, when darkness was coming on apace elsewhere, and that the great teachers there retained a singularly living hold of the central doctrines of the gospel, and above all the evangelist's commission given by the great Head to his Church, and of the supremacy of his Holy Word. We doubt if, anywhere in the early literature of the Christian Church, more emphatic reference will be found to that commission than in the confession of St. Patrick, or a more touching and hearty vindication of the supremacy of Scripture than in Columbanus's letters to Gregory the Great and Boniface IV. Even Adamnan says that they were wont to support their doctrines "by referring to the testimony of Holy Scripture;" and the Saxon Bede testifies that they "only observed those works of piety and chastity which they could learn in the prophetical, evangelical, and apostolical writings." The teaching of their great doctors, from Patrick to Columbanus, concentrated itself round the person and work of our divine-human Redeemer, — "Christ before, Christ behind, Christ above, Christ beneath, Christ in the heart, Christ in the eye, Christ at home, Christ abroad." 

2. Ritual. — No fragment of a liturgy or missal in any ancient Keltic dialect has yet been brought to light. Mr. Skene, however, the most careful and impartial investigator in our day, does not hesitate to affirm, that, among all of them were commission given by the great Head to his Church, and of the supremacy of his Holy Word. We doubt if, anywhere in the early literature of the Christian Church, more emphatic reference will be found to that commission than in the confession of St. Patrick, or a more touching and hearty vindication of the supremacy of Scripture than in Columbanus's letters to Gregory the Great and Boniface IV. Even Adamnan says that they were wont to support their doctrines "by referring to the testimony of Holy Scripture;" and the Saxon Bede testifies that they "only observed those works of piety and chastity which they could learn in the prophetical, evangelical, and apostolical writings." The teaching of their great doctors, from Patrick to Columbanus, concentrated itself round the person and work of our divine-human Redeemer, — "Christ before, Christ behind, Christ above, Christ beneath, Christ in the heart, Christ in the eye, Christ at home, Christ abroad."

3. Church Constitution. — There can be no doubt that originally the constitution of the Keltic Church was that of other churches of the age. In South Britain there were Romans and British, and with distinct sees. There were at least seven in Wales at the time of the conference at Aust with Augustine of Canterbury. There was no lack of them in Ireland, apparently, in the time of St. Patrick, and the first order of Irish saints; though they seem to have been but tribal bishops, and at times located in groups of seven or more each other. According to the ancient tradition, they were greatly diminished in number under the second and third orders of saints, when the Church assumed more distinctly its monastic and missionary form. Some will have it, that, in North Britain, they were wanting for a time altogether as a distinct order; others say this is an invention of ignorant and prejudiced Presbyterians; but, whether it be true or not, it was certainly no invention of theirs, any more than the shan catalogues of bishops at Armagh, and down from the time of St. Patrick, were the invention of their Anglican opponents. Both statements came from Roman-Catholic sources; and the worst that can be said of the respective parties is, that each may have received too credulously that statement which seemed to favor their own views. The abbot—generally a relative of the chieftain, who endowed the religious establishment, and an important dignitary in it, and, with his council of seniors, not only managed its concerns and those of affiliated houses, but, according to Mr. King, who is himself an Episcopalian) presided in church councils, and decided controversies "in connection with matters of religious opinion and practice." Whether further research shall confirm the conclusions of Drs. Killen and M'Lauchlan, or shall clearly show (what the facts as yet alleged by Drs. Reeves and Skene seem to me hardly sufficient to show) that there were from the first in the monasteries of Scotland, as there were in several of the monasteries of Ireland, the rigour of the name of bishops; whether it shall confirm the opinion of Ebrard, that the Columban bishops were like the abbots and the lectors (simply presbyters appointed to a special work), or that of the learned Irish and Scottish antiquaries, who contend that they had some distinct ordination,—the fact remains that the Keltic Church was a distinct see for centuries they were, in Ireland and Scotland, and the missions on the Continent, subordinate to the presbyter-abbot and his council. This fact,
admitted by Bede, and in harmony with many others recently brought to light by Ritschel, Lightfoot, and Hatch, is capable of explanation on the hypothesis that bishop and presbyter were originally but different names for one office, and that the chief of the latter was developed after the days of the apostles "by little and little," and in some countries more slowly than in others. But on the hypothesis that the bishop, under that name or any other, was by divine appointment distinct from the presbyter, and superior to him, the facts now admitted as to the constitution of the old Irish and Scottish monastic Church seem to me all but inexplicable. The analogy sometimes drawn between the position of such a bishop and that in which a bishop may sometimes find himself in a college or university still,—under a presbyter president or vice-chancellor,—fails in a most important respect; for neither the college nor university is the church in which quâ bishop he is to discharge his function. But in the second period of the Keltic Church the monastery and the church were one; and the special sphere in which the bishop as such had to work was the mother-house, or its affiliated institutions. In all he did he was directed by the abbot and his council, and that even in the act of ordination. If the word ordinantes, which Bede (in Book iii. 5) uses of the presbyter-abbot and his seniors at Iona, is not to be taken in its natural sense of an act done by themselves, then it can only be taken causatively, i.e., of an act ordered or caused to be done by them. That interpretation is hardly less fatal to any claim of the bishop to an office jure divino higher than the presbyter's.

The life of Thomas was an uneventful one, and it seems to have taken no prominent part in the public movements of his day. It was while he still lived that the papal schism, the condemnation of Hus and Jerome, and other important ecclesi-astical events, transpired. His piety was of a mystical type, and his contemplative nature delighted (so we gather from his ascetic and devotional writings) in analyzing the motives and feelings of the soul, and directing the gaze of the soul to Christ. He confined himself to the retirement of the convent, where he sometimes preached, and devoted much time to making copies of manuscripts, amongst which was the Bible. Underneath an old portrait of him are the words, which no doubt fitly characterize his life, "Everywhere I sought quiet, and found it nowhere else than in solitude and amongst books." He left behind him a number of works, all written in Latin, most of which are of a devotional character. Some of the titles of these are, The Garden of the Roses (Hortulus rosarum), The Valley of the Lilies (Vallis liliorum), The Soliloquy of the Soul (Soliloquium animae), The Three Tabernacles (De tribus tabernaculis; i.e., the self, humility, and patience). Sermons to Novices, Sermons and Meditations (Conciones et meditationes) on the life and death of our Lord, and a biography of Florentius Radewijnus. These works, however, would not of themselves have made their author famous, and given to his name a title of the interest which attaches to it. The immortality of his name is derived from the De Imitatione Christi. This work, consisting of four books, derives its name from the heading of the first chapter of the first book. It contains meditations upon the spiritual estate of the soul, and the ways of drawing into a closer and more personal union with Christ, and overcoming the evil tendencies of the natural man. It would be superfluous to say anything in praise of this book, although it must be confessed that its quietistic instructions need to be supplemented by counsels for active work amongst men to make it fully answer the needs of Christians. It is calculated to promote personal piety in retirement, rather than to fit men for engaging in the public battles and work of life. Next to the Bible it has perhaps been the most extensively used manual of devotion in Christian lands. The first printed edition appeared at Augs-
The authorship of the *Imitation of Christ*, although now pretty generally ascribed to Thomas à Kempis, has been the subject of one of the most heated discussions in the history of literature, and one in which not only individuals took part, but also two celebrated monastic orders,—the Augustinians and Benedictines. Even the honor of whole nations was deemed wrapped up in the settlement of the dispute. This discussion was introduced in 1804 by Pedre Marranz, who asserted, on the basis of an alleged quotation of the *Imitation of Christ* by Bonaventura, in his Collocations, that the author must have lived before Bonaventura. About the same time, Rossignoli, superior of the Jesuit College at Arona, near Milan, found a manuscript which was undated, but bore the title *Incipit capitulo primi libri Abbatiae Joh. Gersen or Gesen.* As the establishment had originally belonged to the Benedictines, it was supposed the manuscript was very old; but it was proved to have been brought from Genoa in 1789. It was natural to suppose that the famous chancellor of Paris, John Gerson, was here intended. But the Benedictine Cajetan, secretary of Paul V., sought to turn the discovery to the advantage of the Benedictine order, and had an edition printed in Rome, in which the work was ascribed to the "venerable man John Gersen, abbot of the order of St. Benedict." About the same time he announced the discovery of a Venice edition, in which the statement occurred, "Not John Gerson, but John, abbot of Vercelli, wrote this book." Advocates now arose defending the view that the work was written by Thomas à Kempis, which had been the most current view up to the beginning of the century. In 1386 Cajetan was given a victory, when the congregation of the Index allowed it to be printed under the name of Gersen. But the dispute became more involved, and the advocates of the different views more intense in their convictions. The Italians claimed that it must have been written by an Italian; the French, by the great Paris chancellor; and the Germans, by a German. In 1640 Richelieu ordered a splendid edition, but being urged, on the one hand, by the Benedictines to ascribe it to Gersen, by the Augustinians, on the other, to Thomas à Kempis, he allowed it to go forth as an anonymous work.

A number of works were written on the subject, and Du Cange and Malbrion, among others, espoused the Benedictine side; while Carré (Th. à Kempis, 1651), Herbst, and others, insisting upon the Germanians of the style, and other arguments, urged the view that Thomas was the author. The dispute has been carried on down to the present time. The most important of the more recent advocates of the Gerson authorship are Gréory, and the Italian Bartolomeo Veratti; and, of the Thomas view, Malou, Ullmann, Bishop Hefele, and Kettlewell. On the other hand many editors, like De Sacy (Paris edition, 1833) and Caro (preface to Paris edition, 1875), leave the matter undecided.

The weight of argument is decided on the side of Thomas à Kempis. Leaving out of view the evidence drawn from the contents of the *De Imitatione*, and the alleged Germanisms in the style, we were led to the following conclusions: (1) The anonymous life of Thomas à Kempis, a copy of which, in the British Museum, bears the date 1494, but which was probably written about ten years before, states that Thomas wrote *The Interior Speaking of Christ to the Faithful Soul*, which is the third book of the *De Imitatione*. It adds a catalogue of thirty-eight of Thomas's writings, among which are the four books of the *De Imitatione*. Buschius (Adrien de But) of WIndesheim, in his Chronicles of WIndesheim, written six years before Thomas's death (1494), and Hermann Rey (b. 1408), expressly attribute it to Thomas, the latter speaking of him as a brother at Mount St. Agnes. Further: Peter Schott, who in 1488 edited Gerson's works, does not include it amongst them, but expressly ascribes it to Thomas. (2) By far the larger number of manuscripts before 1500 bear his name, as well as of the printed editions.

There are no contemporary witnesses to the view that Gerson was the author; on the contrary, the lists of Gerson's writings given by John, prior at Lyons, in 1428, and by Caserius in 1429, do not mention the *De Imitatione*. It is true that some of the manuscripts give his name; but this can easily be explained on the ground that Gerson's reputation as a theologian and mystical writer was constantly increasing, while Thomas à Kempis was comparatively unknown. As for Gersen, or Gesen, it is not even proved that a distinct person of this name ever lived; and the most tenable theory is, that the name was a misspelling for the chancellor of Paris.

Lr. — A complete edition of Thomas's works by Sommalix, 3 vols., Antwerp, 1690. One of the best is that of Hirsche, Berlin, 1874. The English editions are too numerous to mention. Cannon Farrar contributed a Preface to the London edition, 1881. For his Life see, besides the one above mentioned, Jodocus Badius Ascensius: *Vita Rec. P. Thomae à Kempis, 1500; Rosweyde: Chronicon monast. s. Agnetis, Antwerp, 1615, cum Rosweydii vindiciis Kempeusibus, 1622; Ullmann: Reformers before the Reformation, Bühring: Th. à Kempis d. Prediger d. Nachfolge Christi, etc., Berlin, 1854; Mooren: Nachrichten über Th. à Kempis, Crefeld, 1855; Kettlewell: *Thomas à Kempis and the Brothers of Common Life*, 2 vols., London and New York, 1882.—The authorship of the *De Imitatione*. Gréory: *Hist. du livre de l'Imitation*, 2 vols., 1842; Veratti: *Disquisitioni filologiche e critiche intorno a l'autore del libro de Imit. Christi*, Modena, 1834; Hefele, and others, insisting upon the Germanians of the style, and other arguments, urged the view that Thomas was the author. The dispute has been carried on down to the present time. The most important of the more recent advocates of the Gerson authorship are Gréory, and the Italian Bartolomeo Veratti; and, of the Thomas view, Malou, Ullmann, Bishop Hefele, and Kettlewell. On the other hand many editors, like De Sacy (Paris edition, 1833) and Caro (preface to Paris edition, 1875), leave the matter undecided.
KEN. Thomas, a devout poet and bishop of the Church of England; b. at Berkhamstead, Hertfordshire, July, 1637; d. at Longleat, Somersetshire, March 18, 1711. He studied at Winchester school and was elected fellow of Winchester College in 1666, and prebendary of the cathedral in 1669. In 1675 he visited Rome, and on his return was accused of leanings towards the Roman-Catholic Church, but falsely. In 1679 he was made chaplain to Mary, at the court of William of Orange, at The Hague, but soon returned to England. In 1683, when he was again residing at Winchester, he showed the metal he was made of by refusing to give up his apartment to Nell Gwynn, the mistress of Charles II., who was visiting the city. When called upon to vacate his room, he replied, “Not for the king’s kingdom!” Charles respected his refusal, and soon afterwards, when the see of Bath and Wells became vacant, made him bishop, exclaiming, “Odds fish! who shall have Bath and Wells but the little fellow who would not give poor Nelly a lodging?” He was with the king during his last hours, and urged him to beg the pardon of his wife for his miserable treatment of her, pronounced absolution over him, and offered him (though in vain) the sacrament. He was loyal to James II., but refused to read the Declaration of Indulgence which that sovereign ordered (May 4, 1688) to be read in the churches, and was one of the seven bishops thrown into the Tower. At the accession of William and Mary he continued to be loyal to the fortunes of the exiled king, and, refusing to take the oath of allegiance, was in 1691 deprived of his see. He retired to Longleat in Somersetshire, where he spent the remainder of his days, and, for the greater part of the time, preserved from want by an annuity from Queen Anne, of two hundred pounds. He declined to be reinstated in his bishopric at the death of his successor, in 1703.

Bishop Ken was a man of rare piety and sweetness of spirit, and of fearless independence. He was a Non-juror from conscientious convictions. Macaulay speaks of his “moral character, when impartially reviewed, as sustaining a comparison with any in ecclesiastical history, and as approaching, as near as human infirmity permits, to the ideal perfection of Christian virtue.” Of his ability in the pulpit, no testimony remains, except that of Evelyn, who speaks of “the wonderful eloquence of this admirable preacher.” His sermons are no longer read. Ken has a conspicuous place in our church hymnology as the author of the design of collating the Hebrew manuscripts of the Bible; and, in order to excite interest in his plans, he published The State of the Printed Hebrew Text of the Old Testament considered, Oxford, 1755–56, 2 vols. The expenses of the collation were borne by a subscription of ten hundred pounds. Very many persons at home and abroad were employed: chief of these was Professor Paul Jakobus Bruns of Helmstädt (d. 1814), who collated Hebrew manuscripts in Germany, Italy, and Switzerland. The work lasted from 1760 to 1769 inclusive. Annual reports were made: six hundred and fifteen Hebrew manuscripts and sixteen manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch were collated. As the result of this long labor,
he published his Hebrew Bible, *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum varia Lectio[num],* Oxford, 1770–80, 2 vols. Meanwhile, in 1761, he took his doctor's degree; in 1767 was made Radcliffe librarian; and in October, 1770, canon of Christ Church, and rector of Culham, Oxfordshire.

The various readings noticed in his Hebrew Bible, and which were printed at the foot of the page, have only been collated by the two was thirteen hundred and forty-six. Kennicott's work was De Rossi supplemented the labors of Kennicott in his *Varia llectiones V. T.,* etc. (Parma, 1784–88, 4 vols.; supplement, 1798). The whole number of manuscripts collated by these two was thirteen hundred and forty-six. Kennicott's work was affected adversely by his reference for the Samaritan Pentateuch, his (1) liberation of the Masorah, and disregard of the vowel-points, his lack of uniformity, and occasionally of accuracy, and his defective judgment. But, on the other hand, his service to textual criticism was immense, and he deserves the highest praise. See Horne: *Introduction,* 14th ed., p. iv. 674; Davidson: *Biblical Criticism."

**KENOSIS.** *See Christology, pp. 461 sqq.*

**KENRICK, Francis Patrick,** American Roman-Catholic prelate; b. in Dublin, Dec. 3, 1797; d. in Baltimore, July 8, 1863. He was educated at the Propaganda, Rome, came to America 1821; was consecrated coadjutor-bishop at Bardstown, Ky., June 6, 1830; became full bishop 1842; made apostolic delegate over the first plenary council of the United States, convened at Baltimore, May, 1852; and in 1859 the Pope conferred upon him the title of cardinal. As bishop, his services to textual criticism were immense, and he deserves the highest praise. See Horne: *Introduction,* 14th ed., p. iv. 674; Davidson: *Biblical Criticism."

**KERO,** said to have been a monk of St. Gall in the time of Abbot Othmar, 720–759. Melchior Goldast (d. 1635) and Jodocus Metzler (d. 1639) ascribe to him the oldest German translation of the rules of the Benedictines, the *Glossarium Ker- ronis,* and several other works. But the only Kero we know of as monk of St. Gall during the eighth century, is mentioned in a document dated Oct. 28, 769; and internal reasons forbid to consider him the author of the above works. Kero seems, indeed, to be a purely fictitious name under which a number of works were gathered in the catalogues. See Scherher: *Verzeichniss d. Handschriften d. Stiftsbibliothek von St. Gallen,* 310–343.

**KESLER, Johannes (Chessellus, Ahenarius),** b. at St. Gall; d. there March 15, 1574; studied at Heidelberg and Geneva, and was appointed pastor of the French congregation in Dort, 1591, and professor of theology in the University of Leyden, 1611. As a member of the synod of Dort, he sided with Gomarus, and was charged with the drawing-up of the canons. He was also a member of the committee on the revision of the Bible and a prolific writer of polemics.

**Keri and Ketubh.** The margin of the Hebrew Bible exhibits numerous various readings, i.e., variations from the text, of an early date, which have been preferred by Jewish critics to the readings in the text. These are called "Keri ("to be read "); and the text-readings, Ketubh ("written "); — words corresponding to our text (Ketubh) and margin (Keri). The Keri is the most valuable critico-exegetical legacy from the ancient Jewish critics. Dr. Ginsburg states that there are 1,353 Keri in the rabbinic Bibles. The Keri is always printed without points; but the points which properly belong to it are given to the word in the text. To indicate the Keri, a small circle or asterisk is put over the word in the text; e.g., Jer. xiii. 6: Kethibh is יֵהָּבָה; Keri is יִהָבָה; transferring the vowels in the text to the margin gives יֵהָּבָה, while, if the text had its proper vowels, it would read יֵהָּבָה. See GINSBURG, art. in KITTO'S *Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature.*

**KERO,** said to have been a monk of St. Gall in the time of Abbot Othmar, 720–759. Melchior Goldast (d. 1635) and Jodocus Metzler (d. 1639) ascribe to him the oldest German translation of the rules of the Benedictines, the *Glossarium Ker- ronis,* and several other works. But the only Kero we know of as monk of St. Gall during the eighth century, is mentioned in a document dated Oct. 28, 769; and internal reasons forbid to consider him the author of the above works. Kero seems, indeed, to be a purely fictitious name under which a number of works were gathered in the catalogues. See Scherher: *Verzeichniss d. Handschriften d. Stiftsbibliothek von St. Gallen,* 310–343.

**KESLER, Johannes (Chessellus, Ahenarius),** b. at St. Gall; d. there March 15, 1574; studied at Heidelberg and Geneva, and was appointed pastor of the French congregation in Dort, 1591, and professor of theology in the University of Leyden, 1611. As a member of the synod of Dort, he sided with Gomarus, and was charged with the drawing-up of the canons. He was also a member of the committee on the revision of the Bible and a prolific writer of polemics.
the impression he made was so strong, that the magistrate became alarmed, and interfered. After a short interruption, he began again; and in 1535 he became, with the consent of the magistrate, the regular preacher to the evangelical congregation of St. Margaret. In 1537 he was appointed teacher of classical languages in the city, and in 1542 regular pastor of St. Gall. He wrote a number of sermons, in which he upheld both the Pope and the Church of Rome to contempt and ridicule. In 1525 he published an apology for Luther, less effective. He fomented the Socialist movement, and even made an alliance with Ferdinand Laflamme, 1864-68, and a Life of Vadian. See J. J. Bernh.: Johann Kessler, genannt Ahenarius, St. Gall, 1829.

KETTENBACH, Wilhelm Emanuel, Baron von, b. at Münster, Dec. 25, 1811; d. at Burghausen, in Upper Bavaria, July 13, 1877; was educated by the Jesuits at Brig, in Valais, Switzerland; studied law at Göttingen, Berlin, Munich, and Heidelberg; and received an appointment in the Prussian civil service, but gave up this position in 1837; studied theology at Münster; entered the service of the Church; was ordained priest in 1844; and appointed bishop of Mayence in 1851. To restore the Church of Rome to its old power and splendor was the great idea of his life; and, as the acknowledged leader of the Ultramontane party in Germany, he fought for this idea with as much adroitness as audacity. At the Council of the Vatican, in its relation to the State, on an equal footing with other social institutions, he belonged to the minority (see his Das allgemeine Concil, 1869), and he left Rome before its close; but, as soon as the dogma of papal infallibility was promulgated, he accepted it, published it in his diocese, and employed every means at his disposal for the suppression of opposition to it. Well aware of the danger to the realization of his ideas, which arose from the establishment of a German empire under the Protestant house of Hohenzollern, he resisted the consolidation of the new organization in every possible way: he even forbade the celebration of the anniversary of the battle of Sedan in his diocese. In his opposition to Prince Bismarck's policy of placing the Roman-Catholic Church, in its relation to the State, on an equality with other social institutions, no measure seemed to him too mean, if it promised to prove effective. He fomented the Socialist movement, and even made an alliance with Ferdinand Lamsalle. (See his D. Arbeiterfrage und d. Christenhum, 1864.) His writings consist mostly of minor pamphlets destined for certain occasions, such as Freiheit, Autorität, und Kirche (1862), Hirtenbrief über d. Syllabus (1863), etc.

KETTENBACH, Heinrich von, succeeded, in 1552, Johann Eberlin von Günzburg, who was discharged for holding evangelical views as lector in the Franciscan monastery of Ulm, but fled from the city the next year, having delivered a series of sermons, in which he held up both the Pope and the Church of Rome to contempt and ridicule. In opposition to the Council of Trent, held after Sickingen's death, in his defence; and in 1524 he published an apology for Luther, less passionate, but still very effective. After that time he disappears: perhaps he fell in the Peasants' War, which, with or against his will, he had contributed much to start. The story handed down that in 1530 Eck cites him, together with Luther and Blaurer, shows that he had made a considerable impression, as also that he wrote more than what has come down to us. See KEIM: Reform. d. Reichsstadt Ulm. BERNHARD RIGGENBACH.

KEYS, The Power of the, a symbolical term, which in a more extended sense denotes the whole range of the power of the Church, while in a narrower sense it simply means the power of granting or refusing absolution. In the history of the Church the meaning of the term has undergone a most significant development, and it still forms one of the chief points of difference between the different parts of Christendom.

I. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. — The expression "the keys of the house of David" (Isa. xxii. 22) refers to the power which the steward of the king exercised in the royal household; and, by a somewhat extended symbolism, the expression "the key of David" (Rev. iii. 7) refers to the power which Christ exercises in his own kingdom, especially with regard to admission and exclusion. When Jesus solemnly gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven to Peter (Matt. xvi. 19), he thereby simply introduced him into the apostolical office, authorizing him to found the Christian Church; and the commission to the apostles in general (John xx. 23) must be understood in the same sense. At all events, there is in the New Testament no trace of an apostle forgiving sins in the same personal, categorical manner as Jesus did it (Matt. ix. 2); and, even if there were, it would still be doubtful whether such a power—by its very nature a personal charisma, and not by any means an attribute of an office—ever was transferred to the later Church.

From this power of the keys, signifying the general apostolical authority, must be distinguished the power to bind and to loose, which Jesus conferred first on Peter (Matt. xvi. 19), and then (Matt. xviii. 18), not only on the other apostles, but on the whole congregation. The expression "to bind and to loose," which, according to New-Testament usage, requires an impersonal and not a personal object for its completion, means in rabbinical language simply to allow and forbid, to confirm and abolish (Lightfoot: Hora Hebraica in ev. Math., xvi. 19; Vitringa: De sym. vet., 754; Boehmer: Diss. jur. eccl., p. 83; Ritschel: Alkata. Kirche, 2d ed., p. 372), and refers in the above passages of the New Testament exclusively to the social sphere of the life of the Christian Church. The apostolical writings know no other power of forgiving sins as active in the congregation, but the preaching of the gospel (2 Cor. v. 18) and the prayers of the faithful (1 John v. 16; Jas. v. 16); and, when the later Church undertook to rear a different opinion on the basis of 1 Cor. v. 3-5, it erred, as is shown by Ritschel, l. c., p. 387.

II. AMONG THE FATHERS. — Misconceptions of the power of the bind to and loose arose very early. The Clementine Homilies, representing a Judaico-Christian standpoint, know only the original meaning of the two verbs, "to bind" and "to loose," and correctly supplement them with impersonal objects; but at the same time they extend the sense so as to encompass the whole power of the episcopal office as a continuation of the apostolical office (iii. 72). On the other hand, the Gentile-Christian churches of the second century interpreted the power to bind and to loose as an authority to retain and remit sin, and suppose...
ment the two verbs with personal objects. But while thus they found the power of the keys and the power to bind and to loose, making no other distinction between them than that between the more general and the more special expression, the Gentile-Christian churches did not consider the bishop the bearer of this power: it rested with the congregation as a totality.

It is not to be wondered at, however, that some vagueness and confusion should prevail in the ancient Church concerning these ideas. In the further development, Montanism forms an important link. Tertullian teaches that the power to forgive sins belongs to the Church; but, as it belongs to the Church only so far as she is identical with the Holy Spirit, the right to exercise the power belongs exclusively to her truly spiritual members, — the homo spiritualis. In his work De pudicitia he sets forth this idea in opposition to the bishop of Rome, who taught that the power to forgive sins was vested in the whole episcopate (numerus episcoporum). The latter view was then taken up and carried farther by Cyprian. As the bishop, he says, is the heir of the apostolical power, and the seat and organ of the Holy Spirit, he — that is, not the whole episcopate, but every single bishop — has the power to forgive sins.

Optatus of Mileve finally formulates the argument in this way: Christ gave the keys to Peter, and it was Peter who then gave them to the other apostles.

In the works of Cyprian, the phrase "to bind and to loose" always means to retain and to remit sin. Excommunication and reconciliation are identical with anathema and absolution, only that the words have not yet that fulness and explicitness of meaning which they attained during the middle ages. The atoning power of penance still depends upon the activity of the penitent, rather than upon the activity of the Church. All the Church can do is to prescribe the medicine for the wounds which sin has made; and wound and sin, medicine and penance, physician and priests, are ever recurring similitudes. Nevertheless, the Church is not altogether without some kind of a mediating office. Extra ecclesiam nulla salutis ("outside of the Church no salvation"), says Cyprian; and he repeats it with great emphasis. The nature of this office begins to show in the writings of Augustine. The similitudes change. Sin does not make a wound any more: it kills. The sinner is not a sick man who needs to be cured, but a dead man, who needs to be restored to life. The resurrection of Lazarus is woven into the whole argument. This restoration to life the Church, of course, cannot perform; but Augustine asserts (Serm., 99, 9) that it is done through the Church, by means of the Church. In the writings of Leo the Great, finally, the Roman-Catholic idea of the priesthood as a mediatorial power mediating between God and man, and without whose mediation no divine grace can take effect, becomes definitely formed: without the intercession of the priest, sin cannot be forgiven, — ut indulgentia Dei nisi supplicationibus sacerdotum nequeat obliteri (Ep. 108, ad Theod., cap. ii.).

DURING THE MIDDLE AGES, AND IN THE ROMAN-CATHOLIC DOMATICS. — The primitive Church distinguished between three classes of members, — the faithful, the catechumens, and the penitent. The power of the keys was established chiefly in the first class, but in some respects also in the second; but there is nothing which indicates that the faithful ever made a confession of sin to the priest, even not before partaking of the Lord's Supper. Early in the middle ages, however, and among the newly converted German peoples, a tendency arose to make penance, which originally was of a more general character, into a more special expression, a general characteristic of the whole Church, and to establish the power of the keys, which originally dealt with the penitents only, as a general court of judicature above all the faithful. The first germ of that tendency may be discovered in the circumstance, that, through the monastic discipline, sins in thought gradually became subject to the power of the keys, which in the primitive Church they were not. (See WASSERBachLEben: Bussordnungen der abend ländischen Kirche.) In the monasteries it was considered a rule of discipline to confess to the brethren even the slightest occurrence of sinful emotions. The penitential of Vinnian, an Irishman who flourished in the old Briton Church towards the close of the fifth century, prescribes for sins in thought a rigid fast for half a year, and abstinence from wine and meat for a whole year. The Anglo-Saxon penitential, which bears the name of Theodore of Canterbury, prescribes from twenty to forty days' fast for feeling lust. Columban (d. 615) brought this whole system to the Continent; and so rapidly it did take root there, that Abbot Othmar of St. Gall (d. 781) sets it forth as a maxim, — no confession, no forgiveness of sin; and Bepino of Primi (d. 915) demands that every member of the congregation shall confess at least once a year. The first provincial synod which makes confession a general duty is that of Aenham, 1109. Innocent III. (1198—1216) finally introduced confession throughout the Church in spite of the opposition which the penitentials produced, especially in France.

With regard to the theological definition of absolution, and the part belonging to the priest in its administration, two different views run almost parallel with each other during the first part of the middle ages. According to the one view represented by Jerome and Gregory the Great, the priest is simply judge in foro ecclesiae: he declares that forgiveness has taken place, but takes no part himself in the act of forgiving. The divine forgiveness takes place before the absolution by the priest, even before the confession by the sinner, in the very moment the heart repents. How prominent this view was, even in the twelfth century, may be seen from the manner in which Gratian treats the subject (caus. xxxii. qu. iii.). He raises the question whether or not a sinner can satisfy God by repentance only, and secret penance without confession; then he considers the arguments and the answers on both sides, but finally leaves the reader to decide the question for himself. Petrus Lombardus, the contemporary of Gratian, defines (lib. iv. dist. 17) the priest's power to bind and to loose as a power merely of declaration, just as the disciples could not free Lazarus from his bands, but could only revivify him. Still more explicit are Cardinals Robert Pulleyn (d. 1150) and Peter of Poitiers, chancellor of the university of Paris (d. about
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1924. According to the other view, represented by Leo the Great and Alcuin, the priest is not simply judge in foro ecclesiae, but in foro Dei,—a true and indispensable mediator between God and the penitent. It found its full development in the De vera et falsa paenitentia, a work belonging to the eleventh or twelfth century, ascribed to Richard of St. Victor and in that of Regino of Prüm. The priest appears as the representative of God, or as a kind of God himself; and, in his De poestate lignandi et solvendi, Richard of St. Victor explains how God transforms the eternal punishment into a transitory one, and how the priest transforms the transitory punishment into a penance.

These views were dialectically reconciled, and combined with each other, by the great schoolmen of the thirteenth century, especially by Thomas Aquinas. He starts from the propositions on which the first of the above-mentioned views is based,—that it is only an agent who can forgive sin, and that he does so solely for the sake of the sinner's repentance. But he considerably modifies the bearing of these propositions by adding that no repentance can be full, or fully effective, unless it involves a desire for the sacramental confession and absolution. And he finally reaches the second, the opposite view, by defining the part belonging to the priest in the sacrament of penance in analogy with that belonging to the water in the sacrament of baptism: the priest is the instrumentum animatum, as the water is the instrumentum manumatum. He consequently defends with great ardor the formula, Ego te absolve, etc. (Opusc. xxii.). The view of Thomas was dogmatically fixed, and officially adopted as the doctrine of the Roman-Catholic Church by the Council of Trent in its fourteenth session, Nov. 25, 1551.

IV. DURING THE REFORMATION, AND IN THE PROTESTANT DOGMATICS.—With the Reformation, all those ideas which are covered by the expression, "the power of the keys," entered a new stage of development. From the Roman-Catholic Church, Luther retained confession and absolution, but he found them empty forms, more apt to foster a false self-sufficiency than to strengthen the faith. The church-ban was early taken out of the hands of the clergy, on account of the misuses they made of it; but, in the hands of the consistory, it entirely lost its religious character, and became an appendix to the police-institution. The first powerful attack on the reigning state of affairs was made by the Pietists, but it was renewed by the Rationalists. And when, in the contest, the orthodoxy of the old Lutheran school attempted to represent the power of the keys as a divinely established institution, they not only failed utterly, but had to look on in idleness while the institution was crumbling into pieces. In Protestant theology the power of the keys has been neglected as a merely symbolical expression, and the various ideas comprised by the term have been treated, in dogmatics, under the head of grace and justification; in practical theology, among the preparations to the Lord's Supper; and in canon law, under discipline.

LIT. STEITZ: D. römische Bußsacrament, Francfort, 1554, and Privathaft der Church, simply as the mere symbolical expression, and the various ideas comprised by the term have been treated, in dogmatics, under the head of grace and justification; in practical theology, among the preparations to the Lord's Supper; and in canon law, under discipline.

KANE. See Inn.

KHLESL, Melchior, b. in Vienna, 1553; d. there Sept. 18, 1630. His parents were Lutherans, and he was educated in the Protestant faith; but in 1569 he embraced Romanism, studied under the Jesuits, and was ordained priest in 1579. His ambition, however, forbade him to enter the order; but he was made administrator of Neustadt 1688, bishop of Vienna 1598, and cardinal in 1616. Though his own faith does not seem to have been of the safest description, he placed himself at the head of the counter-reformation in Austria, and spared neither cunning nor violence in his labor. He was deeply implicated in the intrigues which cost, first Rudolph II., and then
KIDRON. 1244

KIMCHI.

Matthias, the crown. Under Matthias he was president of the privy council; but under Ferdinand he was imprisoned, 1618, and not released until 1627, through the intervention of the Pope. See HAMMER-PURGSTALL: Leben des Cardinal K., Vienna, 1847-51, 4 vols.

KIEF, one of the oldest cities of Russia, stands on the western bank of the Dnieper, and contains about sixty thousand inhabitants. It was the cradle of the Russian Church. In 988 Vladimir, who had recently been baptized himself, and espoused a Byzantine princess, ordered the whole population of the city — men and women, young and old — to descend into the Dnieper, while some Byzantine priests, standing on the cliffs of the bank, read aloud the baptismal formula. Thus the city was Christianized. A metropolitan see was founded there, and it was the seat of two presidents of the privy council; but under Ferdinand of Smolensk was elected bishop, in spite of the objections of the metropolitansee of Smolensk. See KIEF.

KIERKEGAARD, Søren Aaby, b. in Copenhagen, May 5, 1813; d. there Nov. 11, 1855; studied theology, and spent his whole life in his native city, devoting himself to a literary activity of enormous dimensions and a very striking character. He was rich and a bachelor. In 1843 he published pseudonymously his first large work, "Vhhich of these two types ought to be chosen?" But on the same day he also published, over his name, a small collection of sermons, thus answering the question himself: Neither; for religion alone contains the truth of life. This double track of production — one line of critical analysis published pseudonymously ("Bits of Philosophy, Judgments upon the God, etc."); and another, of positive construction, published over his name (Training for Christianity; Deeds of Charity, etc.) — he then continued to follow, as it would seem, according to a preconceived plan; and the plan he executed with complete mastery of the subject of his book, with such a richness and originality of productivity, and with so consummate dialectical skill, that all criticism grew silent. His positive construction, however, of Christianity, did not seem to find many adherents. Dogmatically he defined Christianity as the paradox; ethically, as "a passionate leap" away from the world. The ideas of creed, church, priest, etc., he altogether rejected. A Christian is, according to him, an insulated individual, alone with God, and in contact with the world only through suffering. Nevertheless, when he was through with the theoretical representation of his views, and began the practical application, attacking the Danish Church with merciless sarcasm and open denunciation, it was evident that at least something of his Christianity had sunk deeply into the people, and was silently fermenting. Several of his books have been translated into German; e.g., by A. BÄRTHOLD at Halle, Die Lilen auf dem Felde u. die Vögel unter dem Himmel. Hoherpriester, Zöllner, Der Kilham, Alexander, founder of the "New Connection of Wesleyan Methodists," frequently called the "Kilharnites;" b. at Epworth, Eng., July 10, 1702; d. in 1768. In 1742 he was admitted by Wesley into the regular itinerant ministry; rose to prominence; was, even before Wesley's death, an outspoken advocate of separation of the Methodists from the Church of England. After Wesley's death he was expelled from the London Conference (1798). This action resulted in the forming of the "New Connexion." See KILHAM.

KILIAN, St. Rabanus Maurus (from the middle of the ninth century) tells us, in his Martyrologium. Notker Balbulus of St. Gall (from the end of the ninth century) knows much more of Kilian, and tells us, in his Martyrologian, that Kilian was the first bishop of Wurzburg, and preached on a license from the Pope; that Gozbert was Duke of Franconia, and was by Kilian compelled to divorce his wife Geila, because she was the widow of his brother, that Geila, from revenge, had Kilian and his companions assassinated, but afterwards became insane; that heavy punishments for the murder of the saint were inflicted upon all the descendants of Gozbert, etc. In the biographies of the tenth and eleventh centuries the legend develops still further, until it finally loses all historical elements and becomes a legend. See KILIAN.

KIMCHI or KIMHI is the name of a Jewish family which flourished at Narbonne, Southern France, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and produced several learned rabbis. The most celebrated member of the family was David Kimchi, b. in 1160; d. about 1240. Of his personal life nothing is known; but he must have enjoyed a great reputation among his co-religionists, as he was chosen arbiter in the controversy which the doctrines of Maimonides caused between the Spanish and the French Jews. He was a prolific writer; and his principal works are, a Commentary on the Psalms (first printed in 1477, at Bologna, and translated into Latin by Janvier, Constance, 1544), a Hebrew grammar (generally called Miktale, perfection, edited, with notes, by Elias Levi, Venice, 1545, and by M. Hechim, Furth, 1793, and translated into Latin by Guidoetz, Paris, 1540), and a Hebrew dictionary, The Book of Roots, Naples, 1491, edited.
by Elias Levita (Venice, 1540) and Biesenthal and Lebrecht (Berlin, 1847), and translated into Latin in 1535. The Hebrew Grammar of F. E. König (1st part, Leipzig, 1841) is profitably based upon Kimchi; and all Hebrew grammarians have drawn more or less from him. For six hundred and fifty years he has been the acknowledged greatest Jewish grammarian, lexicographer, and biblical commentator. Besides the Commentary on the Psalms mentioned above, he wrote upon Genesis and all the prophets. His work upon Zecharias was translated by McCaul, London, 1837. See art. Kimhi, in Encyclopedia Britannica, 9th ed., vol. xiv.

KING, John, D.D., b. at Wornall, Buckinghamshire, about 1559; d. in London, March 30, 1621. He was graduated at Oxford, and was successively chaplain to Queen Elizabeth, archdeacon of Nottingham (1590), dean of Christ Church (1595), and bishop of London (1611). James I. called him the "king of preachers;" others, "the greatest Jewish grammarian, lexicographer, and biblical commentator. Besides the Commentary on the Psalms mentioned above, he wrote upon Genesis and all the prophets. His work upon Zecharias was translated by McCaul, London, 1837. See art. Kimhi, in Encyclopedia Britannica, 9th ed., vol. xiv.

KING, Jonas, D.D., b. at Hawle, Mass., July 29, 1792; d. at Athens, Greece, May 22, 1869. He was graduated at Williams College, 1816, and at Andover Seminary, 1819; entered the Congregational ministry; labored as missionary in Syria (1823-26), and in Greece from July, 1828, to his death. He published several volumes of translations, and original works in modern Greek. His work in Athens was at all times disliked by the ecclesiastical authorities; and in 1844 efforts were made to induce him to leave. He was brought into controversy, in one of the principal newspapers, upon the subject of Mariolatry, and published a book upon it, made up principally of extracts from Greek saints who taught as Dr. King did. In 1845 this book was condemned by the Greek synod; "every orthodox Christian" was prohibited from reading it; and Dr. King's "false principles, opinions contrary to the basis of the religion of the Oriental Church." Appeal was taken to the Areopagus, which decided that the penal law forbidding the expression of sentiments and opinions contrary to the basis of religion and morals did not apply to the case of Dr. King. The appeal began March 5, 1852, and lasted six hours. He was condemned on the very count which the Areopagus had declared had no bearing upon his case, sentenced to imprisonment for fifteen days in the city prison, to pay the expenses of the trial, and then to banishment from the kingdom. On the 9th of March he went to the prison in Athens, a vile place; so that he was glad to be removed the next day to the police-office, where he was kindly treated. On March 13 he fell ill, and was taken home, where he was guarded. The Areopagus decided adversely to him, but reduced his imprisonment to fourteen days and to banishment. But he was, in reality, imprisoned only the one day mentioned above; and the latter part of the sentence was never executed: indeed, in 1854 he was officially informed that it had been revoked. As might have been expected, the case excited great interest, and the Protestant world demanded his protection. He was never free from petty persecution; was anathematized in 1863 by the Holy Synod of Athens; but his liberty was not taken away. See the reports of the American Board for the years cited; also the Missionary Herald, June, 1852, for the trial. Among his numerous publications may be mentioned The Oriental Church, and the Latin, New York, 1865. See his Memoir, New York, 1879.

KING, Thomas Starr, a Unitarian clergyman, son of a Universalist clergyman; b. in New-York City, Dec. 17, 1824; d. in San Francisco, Cal., March 4, 1864. His education was desultory; but he made the most of his advantages, and acquired a knowledge of many literatures. When fifteen, his father's death compelled his earning his own living, and he was in business for some six years. But the call to preach was his, and in 1845 he began his life-work. In 1846 he settled in Charlestown, over a Universalist Church; from 1848 to 1860, in Boston, over the Hollis-street Unitarian Church; from 1860 to his death, in San Francisco, in the same denomination. By his eloquence and energy he did more than any other man to save the State of California to the Union: for in the early days of the civil war there seemed to be some danger that it would secede. He also was the prime mover in the branch of the United States Sanitary Commission organized there. His reputation was national, for his popularity as a lecturer had carried him everywhere. Personally he was most lovable; intellectually he was one of the most brilliant speakers America has produced. One peculiarity in his preparation for the pulpit was, that he dictated his discourses to an amanuensis as he walked up and down his room. He published only one book, The White Hills, their legends, landscape, and poetry (Boston, 1851); but there have been several collections of his lectures and sermons published in Boston since his death: Patriotism, and other papers (1861), Christianity and Humanity (sermons) (1877), Substance and Shone, and other lectures (1878). See A Tribute to Thomas Starr King, by Richard Frothingham, Boston, 1864; and the Memoir, by E. P. Whipple, prefixed to Christianitv and Humanity, pp. vii.-lxxx.

KING, William, Archbishop of Dublin; b. in Antrim, May 1, 1650; d. at Dublin, May 8, 1729. He studied at Trinity College, Dublin, 1677-78; ordained, 1674; became dean of St. Patrick's, 1688, as a reward for his stanch Protestantness; which very fact led to his dual imprisonment that same year, in Dublin Castle, by James II. In 1691 he was made Bishop of Derry, and in 1702 Archbishop of Dublin. He was a profound metaphysician and theologian. He wrote The State of the Prot-
of Judah. It became more distinct in David's reign, more fully in Jacob's prophecy of the everlasting kingdom, and of a king of righteousness and peace (Ps. xxii., lxxii., cx.). In Daniel the eternity of this kingdom, revealed himself as the one, who, in human imitation, can do all that he wills. Weak, and nothing in themselves, but strong and mighty in God, such is the progressive experience of the people of God, from the patriarchs down. This people was chosen to be God's kingdom, his property above all the powers of darkness being dispelled, and Satan bound; and the millennial kingdom (see Millenium) will begin, which is only the prelude of the absolute consummation of the kingdom of God, when God shall be all in all (1 Cor. xv. 28).

Everywhere in the Scriptures there is a hope of Israel looking forward with ardent longing. In contrast with the pomp and ostentation of the world, its beginning was inconspicuous. The promised One came into the world in circumstances of poverty. He, the eternal Son, to whom the kingdom belongs, because all things are made by him and consist by him, desired to come into the actual possession in God in a process of evolution or development, as some of the parables of Matt. xii. teach. In the Old Testament we have merely the shadow of this kingdom, a preparative economy. In the New Testament it is embodied, in its very essence, in the divine-human kingdom, state, and culture must be governed by his will! the Freedom of Alan's Vill;a-Sermon (London, 1731; 4th and best ed., 1758; 5th ed., 1781), in which he endeavors to show that the existence of evil can be reconciled with the goodness of God, and explained without resort to the supposition of an evil principle.

KINGDOM OF GOD, The. The idea of the kingdom of God is the central idea of the whole dispensation of revelation. The Kingdom of God is the end and motive of all divine revelations and institutions of the old and new covenants; yea, of the creation and promise from the beginning. The general foundation of this idea is the all-inclusive power and dominion of God (1 Chron. xxix. 11; Ps. civ. 10; Dan. iv. 34). But the main aim and centre of revelation is the moral kingdom of God, which is called the kingdom of grace, and, with reference to its consummation, the kingdom of glory. This kingdom (Eph. i. 10) includes the heavenly angels, who do God's will (Ps. civ. 20), and mankind. The latter come especially under the cognizance of the Scriptures. At the fall, man defaced the divine image, became disobedient to the divine will, and passed outside of the kingdom of God. His restoration begins with self-humiliation. In Paganism the light of God in man became more and more darkened, and the faith which gives God all the glory, more and more indistinct. God chose to establish his kingdom by the separation of a peculiar nation, and of an individual (Gen. ix. 26), who should become the recipient of a promise for all nations. God revealed himself as the one, who, in human impotency, can do all that he wills. Weak, and nothing in themselves, but strong and mighty in God, such is the progressive experience of the people of God, from the patriarcha down. This people was chosen to be God's kingdom, his property above all the peoples of the earth,—a kingdom of priests (Exod. xix. 6). On account of its sinful incompetency, Israel was only the sediment of the kingdom of God, which, however, was to some extent realized in believing individuals, pious kings, and prophets. The idea of this kingdom came out more fully in Jacob's prophecy of the prince out of Judah. It became more distinct in David's prophecy of the everlasting kingdom, and of a king of righteousness and peace (Ps. xxii., lxix., xx.). In Daniel the eternity of this kingdom, and its superiority over the kingdoms of the world, are strongly brought out.

To this kingdom of promise and prophecy the hope of Israel looked forward with ardent longing. In contrast with the pomp and ostentation of the world, its beginning was inconspicuous. The promised One came into the world in circumstances of poverty. He, the eternal Son, to whom the kingdom belongs, because all things are made by him and consist by him, desired to come into the actual possession in God in a process of evolution or development, as some of the parables of Matt. xii. teach. In the Old Testament we have merely the shadow of this kingdom, a preparative economy. In the New Testament it is embodied, in its very essence, in the divine-human kingdom, who shows perfect subjection to the divine will, and establishes the kingdom amongst men, first by his redeeming activity, and then by the establishment of the Church. Jesus is the embodiment of the kingdom of God, the ideal of human life; and religion, state, and culture must be governed by his law. It is the task of this evangelical period of Christianity to restore the right relation between the Church on the one hand, and the world, and the State on the other, and to establish the freedom of the Church and the primacy of religion as a moral force with the right to control the life of the State and the department of culture, as well as individual conduct. The complete con-
summation of the kingdom of God can only be realized here in part, and presupposes the emanicipation of the Church from all admixture with the spirit of the world. Then it will appear in its power and glory. Its consummation belongs to the hereafter, and will be the product of the life-giving energy concentrated in the divine-human person of Christ, who, in the midst of the natural development of this world, is separating for himself a distinct kingdom of God, and, after his decisive victory over the satanic power which is concentrated in anti-Christ and his kingdom, will establish it in its visible and complete perfection. [Maurice: *The Kingdom of Christ*, London, 1888; Hengstenberg: *History of the Kingdom of God under the Old Testament*, Edinburgh, 1872, 2 vols.; H. Brockmann: *Geschichte und Lehre d. Reichs Gottes*, 2d ed., Hanover, 1877.]

**Kingly Office of Christ.** See Jesus Christ, Three Offices of.

**Kingo, Thomas, b. at Slaugerup, in the Island of Seeland, 1644; d. at Odense, in the Island of Funen, 1677.** A poet born, and a powerful Christian character, and he has given the Danish Church some of its poetical and religious treasures. In 1668, and bishop of Funen in 1677. He was a poet born, and a powerful Christian character, and he has given the Danish Church some of its very best hymns. Of his *Aandelige Sjunge-Chor*, the collection of his hymns, first part appeared 1674, second, 1681. Charged by the government with the compilation of a new hymn-book, he edited the so-called *Kingo's Psalmesboeg*, 1699, which is still used in many places in Jutland and Norway. See Brandt and Helweg: *Den Danske Psalmeditoring*, Copenhagen, 1847.

**Kings of Israel.** The Israel was a theocracy; i.e., God was the real ruler. The king was only God's viceregent (1 Sam. x. 1; Judg. viii. 23), and from God proceeded all authority (Isa. xxxii. 22). As this idea was conceived by the Israelites, it was limited to the chosen people. God resided in this sense, the king of the whole world; he would only become so when he came in his final kingdom: and the nations of the Gentiles bowed to him as the God of Israel (Exod. xv. 18; Ps. x. 16, lxixix. 19, xcliii., xcvi., xcviii., xci.; Isa. xxiv. 23, xlix. 15; Obad. 21; Zech. xi. 9). The Mosaic legislation did not provide any one central earthly organ for the divine authority: still it plainly declared the eventual rise of a king, and therefore laid down rules for the contingency (Deut. xvii. 14-20). Some critics have pronounced this section a composition of Samuel's; but the mention of horses and of a possible return to Egypt in verse 16 is a weighty argument against the opinion. The rise of the Israelitish kingdom is related in 1 Sam. viii. The reason given was a desire to be like the nations round, but the occasion of the vigorous expression of the wish was the unfitness of Samuel's sons to rule. Once before in the history of Israel had there been a "king:" for Abimelech, the son of Gideon by a concubine, was proclaimed king by the Shechemites, and ruled for three years; but his power was local. The way in which the elders asked for a king was really his own wish, and so was the virtual rejection of Jehovah's supremacy; and so the Lord regarded it (1 Sam. viii. 7). *Notwithstanding*
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KINGO, Thomas, b. at Slaugerup, in the Island of Seeland, 1644; d. at Odense, in the Island of Funen, 1677. He was a poet born, and a powerful Christian character, and he has given the Danish Church some of its poetical and religious treasures. In 1668, and bishop of Funen in 1677. He was a poet born, and a powerful Christian character, and he has given the Danish Church some of its very best hymns. Of his Aandelige Sjunge-Chor, the collection of his hymns, first part appeared 1674, second, 1681. Charged by the government with the compilation of a new hymn-book, he edited the so-called Kingo's Psalmesboeg, 1699, which is still used in many places in Jutland and Norway. See Brandt and Helweg: Den Danske Psalmeditoring, Copenhagen, 1847.

Kings of Israel. The Israel was a theocracy; i.e., God was the real ruler. The king was only God's viceregent (1 Sam. x. 1; Judg. viii. 23), and from God proceeded all authority (Isa. xxxii. 22). As this idea was conceived by the Israelites, it was limited to the chosen people. God resided in this sense, the king of the whole world; he would only become so when he came in his final kingdom: and the nations of the Gentiles bowed to him as the God of Israel (Exod. xv. 18; Ps. x. 16, lxixix. 19, xcliii., xcvi., xcviii., xci.; Isa. xxiv. 23, xlix. 15; Obad. 21; Zech. xiv. 9). The Mosaic legislation did not provide any one central earthly organ for the divine authority: still it plainly declared the eventual rise of a king, and therefore laid down rules for the contingency (Deut. xvii. 14-20). Some critics have pronounced this section a composition of Samuel's; but the mention of horses and of a possible return to Egypt in verse 16 is a weighty argument against the opinion.

The rise of the Israelitish kingdom is related in 1 Sam. viii. The reason given was a desire to be like the nations round, but the occasion of the vigorous expression of the wish was the unfitness of Samuel's sons to rule. Once before in the history of Israel had there been a "king:" for Abimelech, the son of Gideon by a concubine, was proclaimed king by the Shechemites, and ruled for three years; but his power was local. The way in which the elders asked for a king was really his own wish, and so was the virtual rejection of Jehovah's supremacy; and so the Lord regarded it (1 Sam. viii. 7). *Notwithstanding*
no king of Judah offered sacrifices by his own hand. Notwithstanding all this, the government had a popular character. There was no worship of the king, as among other Oriental peoples: on the contrary, he was directly and at any time accessible, administered justice personally, and moved freely among the people. (Compare the life of an Egyptian king, bound by etiquette.) Like Orientals, however, the king had his harem, and it fell to his successor as part of his possessions; so that taking it was equivalent to succession, and a request for any member of it treasonable: hence Ahithophel's advice (2 Sam. xvi. 21; cf. also 2 Sam. xii. 8, iii. 7; 1 Kings ii. 17 sqq.). The succession was usually given to the first-born son (2 Chron. xxi. 3), yet there were exceptions, as Jehoahaz (2 Kings xxiii. 30). During a minority, the kingdom was under a regent (2 Kings xii. 2). As a rule, the mother of the king (the queen-mother) exercised considerable authority, and her name is always given in the official record of an accession (1 Kings xiv. 21, xv. 2, etc.). The king bowed himself unto her (1 Kings ii. 19), while the king's wives bowed themselves to him (1 Kings i. 16).

The disruption destroyed the theocratic government, as far as the northern kingdom was concerned, but it was continued respecting the house of David; and it was to the restoration of the splendor of the Davidic kingdom that the prophets looked (cf. Hos. iii. 5). The Herodian dynasty was a mere caricature.

The court officers under David (2 Sam. viii. 16–18), not counting the princes (1 Kings iv. 2), who were also the king's councillors, were as follows: (1) The general of the army; (2) The captain of the Cherethites and Pelethites, the king's body-guard; (3) The chancellor, who was

### KINGS OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH

Showing their order, relative length of reigns, contemporary kings of Judah and Israel after the division, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kings of Israel Before the Division</th>
<th>Other Kingdoms</th>
<th>Kings of Judah and Israel After the Division</th>
<th>Other Kingdoms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saul 40 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uzziah or Azariah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David 40.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Saul (38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon 40.</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 [Anarchy]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zachariah (5 mos.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shallum (1 mos.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Menahem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Pekah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Pekah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jotham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ahaz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 [Anarchy]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 Hosea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bezec of Tyre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hezekiah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 Samaria taken. End of kingdom of Israel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>791 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rezin of Syria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sennacherib of Assyria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hezekiah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sennacherib</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rezin of Syria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerusalem destroyed 688.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerusalem taken 605.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jehohaz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jehoashek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jehoahaz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zedekiah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Babylonian captivity. End of kingdom of Judah.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diagram of the Kings.** — The design of the foregoing table of the kings of Israel and Judah is to represent to the eye the order in which the kings reigned, and the dates and relative duration of their reigns. The period of Jewish history covered by the table is from B.C. 1066 to B.C. 586, or about 500 years.

Where the reigns were very short (one month or six months), it was necessary to make the "lines" or "steps" representing them somewhat out of the exact proportion. Frequently parts of years are counted in round numbers, as if full years: for example, Nadab's reign is given as "3 years" though it was not precisely that. This will explain several of the figures given. Jehoshaphat associated Jehoram with him during the last two years of his reign: so Jehoshaphat's "25 years" and Jehoram's "6 years" overlap each other.

* Reprinted (by permission of the Am. S. B. Union) from Schaff's Bible Dictionary.
not simply the chronicler as the authorized version, 2 Sam. viii. 16, see margin, but president of the council, and first minister of the crown; (5) The "chanceller," i.e., who had charge of the levies; (6) Priests; (7) Courtiers. To these Solomon (1 Kings iv. 5, 6) added; (8) The officer over the twelve officers who in turn for a month provided victuals for the king and his household; (9) The officer over the household. In addition, there were the usual subordinate court servants. "Eunuchs" appear first to have been employed in the northern kingdom (1 Kings xxii. 9 marg.), but later in Judah (2 Kings xxiii. 11 marg.). By the term, perhaps often only an office is meant.

The royal revenue seems at first to have been derived from the spoils of war (2 Sam. viii. 11 sq. xii. 30), and from presents more or less voluntary (1 Sam. x. 27, xvi. 20, etc.), not only by his,subjects, but by strangers; and these, in the case of Solomon, amounted to a good deal, and were regularly given (1 Kings x. 20, 21), but also from the Israelites (1 Kings v. 13, xii. 4), and on two occasions collected a sort of tribute of bond-service, not only from the remnant of the conquered peoples (1 Kings ix. 20, 21), but also from the Israelites (1 Kings v. 13, xii. 4), and on two occasions collected a sort of tax from the men of wealth in order to buy off an invader (Pul, 2 Kings xv. 20; Pharaoh-nechah, xxiii. 35).

OEHLER. (VON ORELLI.)

KINGS, First and Second Book of. The two books were originally one. The separation was first made by the LXX. (followed by the Vulgate, and so in modern versions), which joined them with First and Second Samuel under the general caption Kings: so that the four together constituted four books of Kings Daniel Bomberg transferred this nomenclature into our Hebrew Bibles.

Our Kings may be divided into three parts: 1. The history of Solomon (1 Kings i.--xi.), with the subdivisions: (a) The history of the separation, and the hostile position of the two kingdoms (i.-ii.); (b) His brilliant reign (iii. 1-ix. 9), under which come (a) his marriage, prayer, and judicial wisdom (iii.), (b) his court and officers, might splendor, and wisdom (iv.-v. 16), (c) his building operations with help of Hiram, king of Tyre, and consecration of the temple (v. 17-ix. 9); (c) His foreign affairs, great reputation and revenue, his degeneracy through polygamy and idolatry, its consequences, and his death (ix. 10-xi. 43). 2. The synchronous history of the divided kingdoms of Israel and Judah (1 Kings xii. 1-2 Kings xvii. 41), with the subdivisions; (a) The history of the separation, and the hostile position of the kingdoms until Ahab's reign (xii. 1-xvi. 28); (b) The history of the dynasty of Ahab, the fatal league of the two royal houses, to the slaving of Jehoram of Israel and Ahaziah of Judah by Jehu (xvi. 29-2 Kings x. 30); (c) The history of the dynasty of Jehu, the overthrow of Israel (xi. 1-xvii. 41). 3. The history of the kingdom of Judah from Hezekiah to its overthrow and the Babylonian exile (xviii. 1-xxxv.), With the release and elevation of Jehoiachin at the court of Evl-merodach the history ends.

But Kings is no mere chronicle, but a work governed throughout by a single purpose, which was to show the fatal effect of disobedience upon the chosen people. This is expressed in 2 Kings xvii. 7 sqq., which in few words tells how Israel, in both kingdoms, had transgressed the plain divine commands communicated through prophets, especially by idolatry, and thus prepared their fall; but further, that for Judah there was hope of restoration, if it would listen to the prophets. Of the fulfilment of this promise the elevation of Jehoiachin was a pledge. Agreeably to the purport of the history, the position of each successive king, from Solomon down, towards the high places, is clearly stated. In Kings are no less than nineteen prophetic words and speeches. Another proof of the unity of the history is the regular recurrence of identical, synonymous, and analogous expressions to express the beginning, duration, and close of each reign, the death and burial of each king, and the theocratic value of his work.

E.g. in 1 Kings cf. xi. 43, xiv. 20 sq.; cf. xv. 3, xxiii. 43; cf. xiv. 9, xv. 26; cf. viii. 16, ix. 4; cf. viii. 61, xi. 4. It links itself immediately on Samuel, and thus closes the great history which begins with Gen. i.

It is characteristic of Kings to make continual references to the original sources. Up to 1 Kings ii. 46 it draws from Samuel's source for the history of David. For the history of Solomon it refers to the "book of the acts of Solomon," xi. 41; for that of the kings after Solomon, it refers fourteen times to the "book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah," and seventeen times to a similar "book" for Israel. Such references are lacking only in the cases of Ahaziah, Amaziah, and Jehoahaz of the southern, and in that of Jehoram of the northern kingdom. The books were doubtless official records. Of a quite different character was the "commentary of the book of the kings," referred to in 2 Chron. xxiv. 27. The histories of Elijah and Elisha rest upon an independent, prophetic, Ephraimitish source.

The age and authorship of the Book of Kings cannot be exactly determined. While throughout the book the kingdom of Judah and the temple are spoken of as standing (to which period, and not to the exile, the recurrent formula, "unto this day," refers), the closing verses (2 Kings xxv. 27-30) set us in the middle of the exile; and so, while the book as a whole was written before the exile, it was revised and brought down to date by some one of the exiles. The Talmud ascribes the book to Jeremiah (Bab. babra 15b), and surely the verbal and mental relationship between it and his writings is striking (2 Kings xxiv. 18-xxv. 30, and Jer. lii. are almost word for word identical); but the first arises from their being written at the same time, and from the familiarity of the author of Kings with Jeremiah's writings; while the second relationship merely shows the dependence of one upon the other, not their common origin. All that can be said upon the matter is, that the Book of the Kings was substantially written in the days of Jeremiah, and the redaction took place after B.C. 561, and before B.C. 536, the close of the exile.

The historicity of the book is universally recognized. The acknowledged difficulties in chronology result from textual errors and corruptions.

LIT. — Modern commentators are KIENZL, M. H., 1845; new ed., Leipzig, 1864; T. REIMANN (Leipzig, 1849; 2d ed., 1873). BAHR (Bielefeld,
KING'S EVIL.

1250

KINGSLEY.

1863 (trans. in the Lange series, N.Y., 1872, Rawlinson (in Speaker's Commentary, Lond., 1873), Hammond (in Pulpit Commentary, 1882), Barlow (in Preacher's Commentary, 1885)).

VOLCK.

KING'S EVIL, as scrofula was called, from the belief, which prevailed for many centuries in France and England, that scrofula could be cured by the touch of the Kings, and at a time when the miracle being "part of the religion attached to the person of the king." In the English Prayer-Book down to 1719, there was a special service (part of the Liturgy) to give due solemnity to the act. (See Hook's Church Dictionary.) Edward the Confessor (1042-66) was the first English sovereign, and Anne (1703-14) the last, to "touch" for the disease. It is said that the famous Dr. Samuel Johnson was the last child "touched." Charles II. (1660-84) "touched" more persons than any other monarch, averaging four thousand a year. Prince Charles Edward, the Young Pretender, began his career by "touching" at Holyrood Palace. Among the French kings who practised the act may be mentioned Louis XI. (1461-83) in 1470, Charles VIII. (1483-88) at Rome and Naples in 1485, Francis I. (1515-47) in 1527, and Louis XVI. (1774-96) at Rheims in 1775.

KINGSLEY, Calvin, D.D., LL.D., Methodist Episcopal bishop; b. at Annsville, Oneida County, N.Y., Sept. 8, 1812; d. at Beirut, Syria, April 6, 1876. After graduating at Alleghany College, Meadville, Penn. (1841), he entered its faculty as professor of mathematics, and, with the exception of two years of pastoral labor, continued in it until 1856, when he was elected editor of the Western Christian Advocate. In 1864 he was elected a bishop; in May, 1869, started upon an episcopal tour around the world, visited the conferences on the Pacific coast, those at Foochow, China, at Bareilly, India, and was passing through Syria when he died. Besides controversial works, he published Resurrection of the Human Body, Cincinnati, 1845; Round the World, Cincinnati, 1870, 2 vols.

KINGSLEY, Charles, b. at Holne Vicarage, Devon, Enlg. June 12, 1819; d. at Eversley, Jan. 23, 1875. He entered Magdalen College, Cambridge, in 1834, where he distinguished himself as a classical and mathematical student. Eversley in Hampshire was his first and last charge; originally as curate, finally as rector. It was a spot which above all others he loved, and in which he found a home for the two ends of his life together. He no sooner began to preach than he began to publish; and his village sermons, which at once made a mark on English homiletic literature, appeared in 1844. Poet as well as preacher, he wrote, four years afterwards, The Saint's Tale, or the Story of Elizabeth of Hungary, in which, with a keen appreciation of medieval life and sentiment, he brought out the idea of true wedded love in its simple purity, contrasted with the falsities of a superstitious asceticism. His own wedded life furnished one of his most charming instances of the kind on record. Not, however, in poetical sentiment was he. Or in domestic felicity, did he allow his time to be absorbed; but looking on the state of society in England, especially amongst men of the working-class, he steadfastly set before himself the task of a social reformer, in company with his friend Mr. Maurice, and other like-minded persons. He laid a foundation for manifold improvements in the condition of working-men, intellectually, morally, and religiously: classes for mental instruction, and unions for pecuniary benefit, sprung out of his efforts at a period when such efforts were by no means popular. He studied the condition of people in London workshops and in rural districts, and, after devoting his mind to the problem of their elevation, wrought out his ideas on the subject by composing two memorable works of fiction, Alton Locke, Tailor and Poet, published in 1849, and Yeast, a Problem, published in 1851. Letters on university reform speedily followed, with Lectures on Agriculture, and at the same time he found himself involved in a controversy on social doctrines, occasioned by the novels he had written, especially the last. Hyæna, or New Foes with an Old Face, appeared in 1853, in which he drew the picture of the social condition of Alexandria in the fourth century, as Greek philosophy and Gothic Paganism came into conflict with the advancement of Christianity, already deteriorated by asceticism and superstition. In all those works, under a clothing of fiction he sought to exhibit lessons of the greatest importance in their bearing on his own age, and the evils which surrounded him in Church and State. With this work may be coupled Alexandria and her Schools; and within the historical class of his productions we must not overlook his lectures on The Roman and the Teuton; but it is only just to say that his philosophy and his imagination too much influenced his reading of facts. He was fond of North Devon, and pitched his tent there for a time, and, amidst the inspiring scenes and traditions of the neighborhood, sat down to write Westward Ho! painting in vivid colors the adventures of the grand old sea-kings of Elizabeth's times, when they made their daring expeditions to the New World. This book, issued in 1855, touched a chord in English hearts which has never ceased to vibrate; and men and women, boys and girls, found and still find enchantments in these brilliant pages. The same year saw his Heroes, or Greek Fairy Tales, relating the story of the Golden Fleece and other classical legends with exquisite simplicity and skill. The Water Babies, a wild fairy-tale, full of incredible dreams: Glaucus, or the Wonders of the Seashore, Hereward the Wake, last of the English, Prose Epics, New and Old,—these are all full of imagination, wrought around facts in nature and facts in history. Kingsley had a keen eye for scientific inquiry, as well as a poet's taste for beauty everywhere; or, to use the language of his loving friend Dean Stanley, "that second listening ear, like that of the first; I am not weary of long tales, but I almost to catch the growing of the grass, and the opening of the shell." He published a number of sermons, The Good News of God, Sermons for the Times, Discipline, The Water of Life, and All Saints' Day; and though he was at home in poetry and fiction, he found a more desired home in the Christian pulpit. When, with the spirit of a Hebrew prophet, he rebuked the sins of the age, and called on high and low to live lives of righteousness in the fear and love of God and Christ. He was much more of a practical than a
he theoretical theologian, and seems to have known and cared very little about the history of opinion, or about systems of divinity. And he did not bring out in his ministry all the truths which are precious to Evangelical Christians. He was not only rector of Eversley, but canon of Chester, to which he was appointed in 1780, thence he was transferred to a canony in Westminster Abbey. He was a royal chaplain. The Prince of Wales as a youth listened to his lectures, and with the younger branches of the Queen's family he was a great favorite. His preaching at the abbey attracted great crowds; and, when he died, the loss was keenly felt by those who only for a few months flocked round his pulpit. The visit he paid to America, and the lectures he delivered there, made a deep impression, and he returned from his Western travels in 1784 to die the following year. Individuality and earnestness to an extraordinary degree were exemplified in his life. He was a great deal more than he ever did, having in him a genius and a spiritual force which no words or deeds could ever exhaust. His letters and sermons are a form of a confederacy; (3) That the confederacy, based on the common evangelical principle of the confessions, should leave to each Church to arrange its relations to the State, its constitution, its ritual, and doctrinal system, as it pleased; while (4) The confederacy as such should represent the unity, bear witness against the non-evangelical churches, administer advice and support, defend the rights and liberties which belong to every evangelical church, etc. The confederation was never established, and no Kirchenrat has been convened since 1871. Nevertheless, the movement exercised a great and beneficial influence, both spiritual and material. From it sprang the Kongress für innere Mission, which holds its annual meetings at various places in Germany, and has greatly extended its activity during the last ten years. Its leading genius was Dr. Wichern till his death (1861). See the transactions of the several sessions of the Kirchenrat at Wittenberg, Berlin, Stuttgart, etc., published by Hertz, Berlin.

KIRCHHOFF, Melchior, b. Jan. 3, 1775, at Schaffhausen; d. Feb. 13, 1853, at Stein, in the canton of Schaffhausen, where he was appointed minister in 1808, after studying at Marburg, 1794—96. He is one of the ablest and most prolific writers of his time. In 1818 he entered the order of the Jesuits, and taught mathematics at Würzburg (whence he was expelled by the Swedes), and afterwards in Rome. Among his works, most of which treat mathematical and physical subjects, are Ars magna lucis et umbrae, Mundus subterraneus, Arca Noe, Turris Babel, etc. He founded the first museum of natural history (in Rome). His autobiography and letters were edited by Louise Frank, A. G. Frank, 1840.
1871 he was pastor of the Mount Vernon Church. He wrote a life of Fisher Ames, and edited his works, Boston, 1809.

Of Killala, 1810. He enjoyed extraordinary popularitv as a preacher, and was particularly noted for his charity sermons. Some of these have been published, with a sketch of his life: Sermons, London, 1814; 2d ed., 1816. It will be remembered that "Kirwan" was the pseudonyme of Dr. Nicholas Murray.

KISHERON, or, in Ps. lxxx. 9, Kl'son, the present Nabr Mukutta, rises on Tabor and Little Hermon, and flows through the plains of Edraelon and Acre, into the Mediterranean, a torrent in the winter time, but almost dry during summer. See Judg. iv. 7, v. 21; 1 Kings xviii. 40.

KISS OF PEACE, The, occurs very early, both in the life and in the worship of the Christian Church, as a symbol of brotherhood and love (Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12; 1 Thess. v. 26; 1 Pet. v. 14). It became, indeed, the common form of greeting each other, especially when people met in the church; and it was given unrestrictedly, without regard to sex, rank, or age, as a natural expression of that community of spirit which bound together all the members of the church. It is apparent, however, that such a custom involved many inconveniences, and was liable to degenerate. Tertullian (Ad Uxor., 2, 4) speaks of the annoyance it must be to a heathen husband to see his Christian wife exchange the kiss of peace with her religious brethren. Origen (In Rom., x. 33) incalculates that the kiss shall be holy, that is, chaste and sincere, and not like the kiss of Judas, but expressive of peace and simplicity unfeigned. And Clement of Alexandria (Protrepticus), 15, seems to censure those shameless kisses which made the churches resound, and occasioned foul suspicions and evil reports (Pedag., 13, 11). Thus certain restrictions soon became necessary. The Apostolical Constitutions (8, 2), prescribe that when the deacon says, "Salute ye one another with the holy kiss," the clergy shall salute the bishop, and of the laity the men the men, and the women the women; and similar restrictions were made by contemporary and later councils. But in that, or in a somewhat similar form, the custom has survived down to our time in the Eastern Church; and in the Western it was not wholly superseded until the thirteenth century, when a plate of wood or metal (osculatorium), stamped with a representation of the crucifixion, was kissed, first by the priest, and then by all the communicants in succession, as a token of their mutual love in Christ. With respect to the special use of the kiss in the worship of the ancient church, at communion, baptism, wedding, etc., see the elaborate article by Edmund Venables, in Smith and Cheetham: Christian Antiquities, ii. 902.

KITTO, John, b. at Plymouth, Eng., Dec. 4, 1804; d. at Cannstadt, Wurttemberg, Germany, Nov. 25, 1854. His father was a poor mason and a drunkard, who could afford him only three years' schooling; and so, in his twelfth year, he began to earn his own living as a barber's apprentice, but was dismissed for supposed connivance at theft. On Feb. 13, 1817, he was assisting his father at his trade; but, "when in the act of stepping from the top of the ladder to the roof of the house, he lost his footing, and fell, a distance of thirty-five feet, into the court beneath." By this fall he was severely injured bodily, and totally and permanently deprived of the second finger of his right hand. On recovering his strength he reported various expedients to gain a few pennies whereby he might buy books; for reading was his passion. His pitiable condition — "pinched with hunger, shivering in rags, crawling about with exposed and bleeding feet" — led to his being put in the Plymouth workhouse, Nov. 15, 1817; but he remained until July 17, 1828, with the exception of a few months (1821-22) of indentureship.
to a shoemaker in the place, who cruelly treated him. In 1823 he attracted the attention of the famous scientist Harvey, and ultimately of other educated persons who were interested in the articles he wrote for the Plymouth Weekly Journal; and he obtained through them the post of sub-librarian of the Plymouth Public Library. The tide had turned with him. From this position he passed, in 1824, into the service of a Mr. Groves, a dentist at Exeter. In 1825 appeared his first volume, Essays and Letters, with a Short Memoir of the Author, Plymouth. Through Mr. Groves's mediation, he was engaged by the Church Missionary Association as printer; and in July, 1825, he went, to learn that art, to the Missionary College at Islington. By this time he had acquired some knowledge of Latin and Greek, and now began Persian. Owing to an unhappy misunderstanding, he resigned December, 1826. The fault was equally his and the committee's. Kitto was too much given to literature to be an efficient printer; and as he never brooked control, and the committee did not deal properly with his sensitive and extraordinary nature, never supposing that the man whom they hired as a mere printer had such lofty pretensions to authorship, a rupture was inevitable. He repented of the step he had taken; and, by the solicitation of friends, he was restored a few months afterwards, and sent to Malta, where he lived for eighteen months. But, owing to the same absorption in literary matters, he broke his rash pledge to abstain from literary pursuits, and so was supposed by the society to be unable to do as much printing as was required. Nothing remained but for him to leave his employ. Arrived in London, he met with Mr. Groves, and engaged to go with him as tutor to his family upon his missionary journey to the East. The party sailed from Gravesend, June 12, 1829, and arrived at Bagdad, Sunday, Dec. 18, 1829. On Sept. 19, 1829, he left that city for England, having practically exhausted his usefulness to Mr. Groves, and arrived at Gravesend in June, 1833. He obtained employment, as a literary hack, with Charles Knight, and wrote industriously for the Penny Magazine and the Penny Cyclopedia. On Sept. 21, 1833, he married. In 1835 he began, and in May, 1838, he finished, for Mr. Knight, the Pictorial Bible, which had an immense and long-enduring popularity. The first edition was in three large octavo volumes, and was reprinted the first year. The standard edition was begun in 1847, and finished in 1849 (4 vols., imperial 8vo). The work appeared at first anonymously; but the real author was soon known. He had at last found his place, and produced in succession the following works: Uncle Oliver's Travels in Persia, 1838, 2 vols.; Pictorial History of Palestine and the Holy Land, including a Complete History of the Jews, 1841, 2 vols.; Gallery of Sacred Characters, 1843; History of Palestine from the Patriarchal Age to the Present Time, Edinburgh, 1843; Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature (which he edited and largely wrote), Edinburgh, 1843-45, 2 vols. (3d ed. greatly enlarged by W. L. Alexander, D.D., London, 1868, 3 vols.); The Pictorial Sunday Book, London, 1845; The Literary Journal, Edinburgh, 1845; 5 vols.; Ancient Jerusalem, 1846; Modern Jerusalem, 1847; The Court of Persia, 1849; The People of Persia, 1849; The Tabernacle and its Furniture, 1849; The Bible History of the Holy Land, 1849 (5th ed., 1867); Daily Bible Illustrations, Morning Readings, 1849-51, 4 vols., and Evening Readings, 1851-53, 4 vols. (new edition by J. L. Porter, D.D., Edinburgh, 1866, 8 vols.).—his most popular, and, next to his Cyclopaedia, his most valuable production. On Jan. 1, 1848, he began the issue of the Journal of Sacred Literature, and was by far the most voluminous contributor; but the Journal had not a sufficient pecuniary basis, and involved him in heavy loss; so that at last, in 1853, after eleven volumes had been issued, he abandoned it to the hands of Dr. Burgess. By these works he won a distinguished position among the popularizers of Bible science. In 1844 the university of Gieseen, Germany, made him a doctor of divinity. In 1845 he became a fellow of the Royal Society of Antiquaries. On Dec. 17, 1850, he was put upon the civil list, and received a grant of a hundred pounds a year "on account of his useful and meritorious works." He had been all his life subject to severe headaches; but in 1851 he manifested decided indications of cerebral debility, and was more or less of an invalid from that time on. In February, 1854, he was forced to stop work. Generous friends raised eighteen hundred pounds for his support. On the 9th of August he left for Germany, and there he died.

Kitto was a layman, although a doctor of divinity. His life was full of vicissitudes, but steadily progressive. The contrast between its beginning and its close was remarkable: in fact, in the entire range of religious biography there is scarcely a parallel case. The totally deaf boy, who in poverty and misery, in cold and nakedness, wandered upon the streets of Plymouth, won for himself a name honored in thousands of homes. The secret of his success, apart from his literary gifts, lay in his indomitable perseverance, buoyed up by his great self-confidence. He never put a low estimate upon himself. His ultimate position was only the realization of the expectations of his boyhood. Much of his success may be explained on the score of his deafness; for, as he was totally cut off from ordinary society, he gave all his time to study. It is a curious fact in this connection, that for some years he scarcely spoke a word; but, by the kindly stratagem of friends upon his voyage to Malta, he was compelled to speak, and recovered the use of his vocal organs. His voice and pronunciation were peculiar, but he ever afterwards was intelligible. Having been all his life a voracious and multifarious reader, and a student whose day was sixteen hours long, it is no wonder that he acquired much learning; yet, owing to his irregular education, it would be perhaps wrong to call him a scholar. "He had as much knowledge of Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and the modern tongues, as sufficed for his purpose." Dr. Kitto was a member of the Church of England, and very catholic and liberal. Every Christian was considered by him a brother. His piety was genuine and genial, permanent and pervasive. His life reads like a romance; but his influence was real and most helpful in his day, and is likely to be in some way permanent. He consecrated his energies to the better understanding of the Bible, and under his directions a multitude explored the mine of divine truth.
KLARENBACH, Adolf, b. at a farm near Lennep, in the duchy of Berg, towards the close of the fifteenth century; was educated at Münster; studied at Cologne; embraced the Reformation, and participated in the reformatory movements at Würzburg, at Bückeburg, where he worked together with the minister, Johann Klopstock), at Osnabrück, and in his native place. In 1528 Klopstock was arrested at Cologne, and summoned before the Inquisition. Klarenbach immediately went to the city to aid him in his defence, but was also arrested. Cologne was at that moment the principal outpost of Rome in Germany. Reformatory tendencies had shown themselves in the city; but the clergy, the university, the magistrature, and the majority of the burghers, were zealous Romanists. Klopstock escaped; but Klarenbach was kept in prison for nearly six months. He was a great admirer of the remonstrances of his friends and his native city. Together with Peter Fließten, he was finally convicted of heresy by the Inquisition, and delivered over for punishment to the secular authorities. Sept. 28, 1529, he was burnt in the square outside the gate. In 1539 the third centennial of his martyrdom was celebrated throughout his native country, and a monument erected in his honor.

C. KRAFFT.

KLEE, Heinrich, b. at Coblenz, April 20, 1800; d. in Munich, July 28, 1841. He was educated in the Roman-Catholic seminary of Marenz, and was appointed professor of theology there in 1825, at Bonn in 1830, and in Munich in 1839, having been ordained priest in 1823. At Bonn his position was in the beginning somewhat difficult, as he was a decided adversary of Hermes and the Hermesian school. He represented the old traditional stand-point of the Church of Rome. To him revelation, Christianity, and the Church formed the one undivided fact of objective reason, which presents no other problems to subjective reason but those of its historical development. But he was an able representative of this standpoint, for his lectures, instructive, sound, and winning; a man of fine discrimination and independent judgment. In 1831 he prepared for Lange's Bibelwerk the Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians, translated into English by Mrs. D. W. Poor and Conway P. Wing, in Schaff's edition of Lange's Commentary, 1868. He also contributed numerous minor essays to the leading theological reviews of Germany, and articles for Herzog's Encyclopædia.

KLOPSTOCK, Friedrich Gottlieb, b. at Quedlinburg, Saxony, July 2, 1744; d. at Hamburg, March 14, 1804. His parents were of the Reformed sect. He was a pupil of the archiepiscopal throne, the lecture-rooms of the Hermesian school. The drama was to him the highest art-form; and the rules, with the elegance of expression and clearness of movement which they produced, he considered as the very essence of poetry. He and his wife translated French tragedies, and wrote original pieces after the same model. Bodmer stood at the head of the English school. The drama was to him the highest art-form; and the rules, with the elegance of expression and clearness of movement which they produced, he considered as the very essence of poetry. He and his wife translated French tragedies, and wrote original pieces after the same model. Bodmer stood at the head of the English school. The drama was to him the highest art-form; and the rules, with the elegance of expression and clearness of movement which they produced, he considered as the very essence of poetry. He and his wife translated French tragedies, and wrote original pieces after the same model. Bodmer stood at the head of the English school.

KLOPSTOCK, Friedrich Gottlieb, b. at Quedlinburg, Saxony, July 2, 1744; d. at Hamburg, March 14, 1804. His parents were of the Reformed sect. He was a pupil of the archiepiscopal throne, the lecture-rooms of the Hermesian school. The drama was to him the highest art-form; and the rules, with the elegance of expression and clearness of movement which they produced, he considered as the very essence of poetry. He and his wife translated French tragedies, and wrote original pieces after the same model. Bodmer stood at the head of the English school. The drama was to him the highest art-form; and the rules, with the elegance of expression and clearness of movement which they produced, he considered as the very essence of poetry. He and his wife translated French tragedies, and wrote original pieces after the same model. Bodmer stood at the head of the English school. The drama was to him the highest art-form; and the rules, with the elegance of expression and clearness of movement which they produced, he considered as the very essence of poetry. He and his wife translated French tragedies, and wrote original pieces after the same model. Bodmer stood at the head of the English school. The drama was to him the highest art-form; and the rules, with the elegance of expression and clearness of movement which they produced, he considered as the very essence of poetry. He and his wife translated French tragedies, and wrote original pieces after the same model. Bodmer stood at the head of the English school.
lished the first edition of the *Niebelungen*. Klopfstock was, so to speak, awakened by Bodmer. He fully adopted his ideas; and the great work of his life was the *Messias*, an epic poem, written in hexameters, published in parts between 1748 and 1790, and translated into English by W. Nind, 1847. The first collected edition of his works appeared at Leipzig, 1798-1810, in seven volumes. The most complete is that of Leipzig, 1844-45, with letters and biographical supplements by Herman Schmidlin.

The two fundamental ideas on which Klopfstock's poesy is based are nationality and religion; and though his *Germanenclam* is somewhat affected, and his *Christenthum* somewhat sentimental, the power with which he forced these two ideas into the spiritual life of his time made him a turning-point in the history of German literature. Modern German poetry begins with him. His power was enormous, inclusive; and, besides this, he exercised, both by his *Messias* and by his *Oden und Geistliche Lieder*, a purely religious influence. In a time in which Lutheran orthodoxy had transformed religion into a mere system of doctrines, Klopfstock made people feel that Christianity is something more,—that it speaks as well to the imagination and the sentiment as to the intellect. More especially he was the singer of the resurrection and the coming kingdom of heaven; and numerous proofs of the deep impression he produced can be found in the German literature. See C. F. CRAMER: *Er und über ihn*, Hamburg, 1780; and DONNA: *Klopstock's Leben*, Weimar, 1825.

**KLÜPFEL, Engelbert**, b. at Wipfelda, Lower Franconia, Jan. 18, 1733; d. at Freiburg, in Breisgau, July 8, 1811. In 1750 he entered the order of the Augustinians at Würzburg; studied philosophy at Erfurt, theology at Freiburg, and was ordained priest at Constance in 1756; taught philosophy in the gymnasiums of Münnerstadt and Oberndorf, theology at Mayence and Constance; and was in 1767 made professor of theology at Freiburg. This appointment roused the jealousy of the Jesuits, who had hitherto held the chair; but Klüpfel was supported by the Austrian court, and allowed to continue his activity unmolested. With the Protestant rationalists, especially Semler, he also carried on a hot controversy in his *Novo Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica*, a periodical which he founded in 1775, and continued to 1790. His principal works are his *Institutiones theologae dogmaticae* (1789), which was used as text-book in many universities, but has been materially altered in its fourth edition by Ziegler. His *De vita et scriptis Comradii Celliti*, containing some autobiographical notes, was published after his death. See JOHANN L. HUG: *Elogium Klüpfel*. KLOSE.

**KNAPP, Albert**, the most distinguished writer of spiritual songs in Germany in the first half of this century; was b. in Tübingen, July 25, 1798; d. in Stuttgart, June 15, 1844. In his second year his parents removed to Alpirbach in the Black Forest, where they remained till 1800. The beauties of the scenery exercised a lasting influence upon the fresh imagination of the young poet. He studied at the theological seminary in Tübingen; but the years were fuller of poetry than of theology. In 1829 he became vicar at Feuerbach, and afterwards at Gaisburg—the two villages near Stuttgart. His intercourse at this period with Wilhelm Hofacker gave him a new insight "into his own corruption and into Christ's grace and majesty, which became the beginning of an entirely new life, and conception of the world."

After passing to Sulz (1825) and to Kirchheim (1831), he was transferred to Stuttgart in 1838, and in 1845 was made pastor of St. Leonard's Church. He endeared himself to his people; and although he was not fitted, like Ludwig Hofacker, by an impressive emphasis of sin and grace, to become a pattern as an awakening preacher, his sermons were noted for a remarkable richness of spiritual thought. He was a man of decided evangelical sentiments, and clung to the Divine Word. "Then is the soul joyful," he says, "when it passes from the confusion of a capricious, dry, and limited human wisdom, into the clear light of the Divine Word."

Knapp's claim to permanent fame rests upon his peculiar gift of spiritual poetry. He was an original poet and a hymnologist. His first efforts appeared in two volumes, under the title *Christliche Gedichte* ("Christian Poems"), and were published, by the generosity of some friends, at Basel, in 1829. Most of Knapp's hymns, which were afterwards incorporated in hymn-books, appeared in this edition. Other volumes of poems appeared under the titles, *Neuere Gedichte* ("New Poems"), 1834, 2 vols.; *Christenlieder* ("Songs for Christians"), 1841; *Gedichte* ("Poems"), 1854, 1866; and *Herbstblüthen* ("Autumn Flowers"), 1859. These volumes contain more than twelve hundred original hymns and poems. Although they are not always classic in form, they are rich in thought. The subjects are drawn from every department.

Men of war, poets, musicians, as well as the beauties of nature and the praises of Christ, are sung. For, as he says, "the whole world belongs to the Christian; and his mind and heart may tarry everywhere except in the domain of sin and vanity, and everywhere seek the vestiges of his God." But he always returned with joy to the Word of God. "Here there is an endless store. Though one may have composed a hundred poems on it with careful labor, yet he has done no more than does a fly when it has walked over the keys of a piano full of music. Especially do I look upon the Old Testament as a real gold-mine of the highest style of poetry." It was his glory, as Fr. Krummacher said, that he laid all his talents at the feet of Christ; and some of his hymns will always continue to be fountains of blessing; as, *An dein Bluten und Erbleichen*; *Eines wünsch ich mir vor allem andern*; *More than all, one thing my heart is craving,* "Schaff's *Christ in Song*, p. 487; *Einer ist, an dem wir kagen*; *Hallelujah, eine lieblich stehn*.

Knapp also did a great work by editing a collection of hymns, *Evangelischer Liederschatz für Kirche und Haus* ("Treasury of Hymns for the Church and Home"), Stuttgart, 1837; 3d ed., 1865. He here gives an admirable selection of 3,580 out of the 80,000 German hymns. In the first edition...
he made many corrections in the hymns, but afterwards confessed he had gone too far in this direction. [Its notices of the hymn-writers are written with skill, and are very valuable.] This work convinced many moderately to sharpen and satisfy the taste for good hymns. Knapp also edited the *Christi Typus* from 1833 to 1835, a Christian almanac, and published some biographies. See *Lebensbild e. A. Knapp* (memoirs begun by himself, and completed by his son, Joseph Knapp) [and a lecture of thirty-seven pages by Karl Gerok: *Albert Knapp, Der schulpädische Dichter*, Stuttgart, 1879].

*F. E. F. Tholuck.*

**KNAPP.**

Georg Christian, b. at Glaucha, 1753; d. at Halle, Oct. 14, 1823. He studied at Halle and Göttingen, and was appointed professor of theology at Halle in 1777, and director of the Francke Institution in 1785. Surrounded on all sides by the prevailing rationalism, he represented the influence of Spener; and the impression he made was both deep and wide, though a natural timidity, which made him shrink from any direct conflict, prevented him from forming a school.


His *Annotations upon some Difficult Texts in all the Books of the New Testament* (Cambridge, 1803), a translation, with improvements of his own,—*Animadversiones in libros N. T. paradoxa orthodoxae* (London, 1859). It was once highly esteemed, and frequently reprinted.

**KNATCHBULL, Sir Norton,** b. in Kent, 1601; d. 1684. He wrote *Annotations upon some Difficult Texts in all the Books of the New Testament* (Cambridge, 1803), a translation, with improvements of his own,—*Animadversiones in libros N. T. paradoxa orthodoxae* (London, 1859). It was once highly esteemed, and frequently reprinted.


**KNEELING (Genuflexion, Prostration).** The Jews prayed standing or kneeling (Neh. ix. 2-4; Matt. vi. 5; Luke xvii. 11, 13; 2 Chron. vi. 13; Dan. vi. 10; Ez. ix. 5, etc.). Among the Christians, however, the kneeling posture very early became the most common. Compare Acts vii. 59, ix. 40, xx. 38, xxx. 5; Eph. iii. 14, not to speak of frequent allusions by Clemens Romanus, St. Ignatius, Hermas, and others. See art. *Genuflexion in Smith and Cheetham, Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, i. 728 sq.

**KNIPPERDOLLING, Berend, See Münster.**

**KNIPSTRO (not Knipstrow, though in Latin Knipstrovius), Johann, b. at Sandow-in-the-Mark, May 1, 1497; d. at Wolgast, Oct. 4, 1556.** He early entered the Franciscan order, and was, on account of his mental brightness, sent to study in the university of Frankfurt-on-the-Oder, where he greatly distinguished himself by defending the theses of Luther against Tetzel in a public disputation, Jan. 20, 1518. In order to prevent his embracing the Reformation, he was by his superiors sent to the Franciscan monastery at Frytz in Pomerania, and then sent to the Jesuits, where he was soon made assistant preacher. He was given passage to Stralsund, where he was made assistant preacher at St. Mary, and afterwards superintendent. At the synod of Trepтов, 1534, the dukes of Pomerania agreed to introduce the Reformation in their possessions; and Knipstro was made superintendent-general over the Wolgast dominions. His activity was, on the whole, more practical than theoretical. His writings (Epistola ad Melanchthonem, Wiedergabe des Bekenntnisses A. Osiandri, etc.) are not many. His life is found in J. H. Balthasar: *Sammlungen*, Greifswald, 1723, 1725, 2 vols., i. 93, and ii. 317-386.

**G. Flitt.**

**KNOBEL, Karl August,** one of the greatest Hebrew exegetes of our age; b. at Tschesechlin, in Lower Lusatia, Aug. 7, 1807; d. at Giessen, May 25, 1863. He was first a Baptist, and then a Universalist minister, but ultimately became a deist. In 1836 he tried for blasphemy before the Supreme Court at Boston. He published *The Deist* (1822, 2 vols.), *Lectures on the Doctrine of Universal Salvation* (Philadelphia, 1824). *Review of the Evidences of Christianity* (1829). But his most notable publication was a translation of the New Testament, with a Greek text, Philadelphia, 1822, 2 vols.

**KNOLLYS, Hanserd,** an eminent English Baptist minister; b. in Chalkwell, Lincolnshire, 1598; d. in London, Sept. 19, 1691. He was educated at Cambridge University, and ordained priest by the bishop of Peterborough. Changing his views on infant baptism, he was recognized as a non-conformist, and subjected to much persecution for preaching. In 1688 he left the country, and sailed for America. Arriving in Boston, he became involved in a controversy with the authorized works. Cotton Mather called him "Mr. Absurd Knowless." He was the first minister of Dover, N.H. He returned to England in 1641, where the remainder of his life was spent in varying vicissitudes, a part of the time as a fugitive on the Continent. Mr. Knollos was a learned scholar and an able preacher, and, before his departure for America, is said to have had the attendance of one thousand persons when he preached in London. He published *Flaming Fire in Zion* (1646), *Rudiments of the Hebrew Grammar* (1648), and his *Autobiography* (1672). The last work was continued by Kiffin, 1852, and reprinted 1813. See also *Knollos, Island* in the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, i. 723 sq.

**The Hanserd Knollys (Baptist) Society was or**
organized in England in 1845 to republish early Baptist writings. **KNOWN-MEN**, a designation for Lollards, and, later, for Puritans, in Henry VIII.'s time; used among themselves to mark the fact of their acquaintance with the New Testament. They considered themselves to be "known men" of God, because they knew God's Book.

**KNOX, John**, the Scottish reformer; b. 1505; d. Nov. 24, 1572; was the son of William Knox, a small landed proprietor of fair though not distinguished descent, in the county of Lanark. His mother's name was Sinclair; and his birth-place (Works, edited by D. Laing, vol. vi. p. 16) appears to have been, not Gifford village, as usually represented, but a suburb of the town of Haddington, known as Giffordoate. It was likewise in Haddington that he received the elements of a liberal education. Haddington early enjoyed the advantage of possessing an excellent grammar-school — one of the schools originating monastic, and due to the public spirit, which, at least as regards education, animated the Scottish Church even antecedently to the Reformation. In these schools, if not, except in rare instances, Greek, at least the Latin language was taught, along with the more ordinary branches of popular instruction. The schools of Aberdeen, Perth, Stirling, Dumbarton, Killearn, and Haddington, are particularly mentioned in contemporary writings, as, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, celebrated for the skill of their masters, and the attainments of the often numerous pupils — including sons of the principal nobility and gentry — who were educated within their walls.

From Haddington school he appears to have proceeded to the University of Glasgow, then not so well equipped as it has since become, being, in the words of its distinguished principal, John Major, "peram dotatum, parumque celebrum," and chiefly adorned by the presidency of a man who was one of the greatest scholars of his times. How long Knox remained at college is uncertain. His name occurs among the Incorporali in the **Annals of Glasgow College** for 1522. It is not to be found in any subsequent year, either in the Glasgow registers, or in those of the other Scottish universities. He may have been a student, however, without matriculating. Knox certainly never made any pretence to be such a scholar as his contemporaries George Buchanan or Alesius; nor is there evidence that he even graduated. That he was a fair Latinist, and accustomed to study, appears, however, from the fact, which seems to be well attested, of his familiarity with the writings of Augustine and Jerome. He acquired the Greek and Hebrew languages after middle life, probably when on the Continent. Knox is said to have been ordained to the priesthood before the year 1530. The fact of his ordination is admitted both by friends and foes; but neither for the date of this event, nor for almost any other incident in the reformer's career, before his matriculation in Glasgow in 1522 and the time when he denounced the errors of Romanism, and, according to Calderwood, Thomas Guillaume, a native of East Lothian, and provincial of the order of Blackfriars, was the first "to give Mr. Knox a taste of the truth." Beza attributes his original change of opinion to the study in St. Andrews, in early manhood, of the writings of Augustine and Jerome. But the immediate instrument of his actual conversion was the equally learned and amiable George Wishart, who, after a period of banishment, returned to his native country in 1544, to perish, in the following year, at the stake, as the last and most illustrious of the victims of Cardinal Beaton. Among other places where he preached the Reformed doctrines in these years, Wishart had come to East Lothian, and there made Knox's acquaintance. The attachment which the latter formed for the person as for the doctrine of Wishart, must, notwithstanding his mature years, be described as of the nature of a youthful enthusiasm. He followed him everywhere, and constituted himself his body-guard. He was then only twenty-two, a two-edged sword, that he might be prepared to defend against the cardinal's emissaries, then known to be seeking Wishart's life. And, on the night of the martyr's apprehension, he was hardly restrained from sharing his captivity, and consequently, in all probability, his fate.

The terms of Wishart's remonstrance are well known: "Nay, return to your bairns (pupils). One is sufficient for a sacrifice."

His first call to the Protestant ministry took place at St. Andrews, a picturesque city, rich in ecclesiastical traditions from the Culdee period, which was throughout his life intimately associated with the reformer's career. There appears to have been no regular ordination. Of course, he was already ordained as a priest in the Church of Rome. But imposition of hands, and other forms in constituting the ministerial character, were (as appears from the List of Ministers of the Church of Scotland, which he afterwards assisted to draw up, and at all events sanctioned) not regarded by Knox as at most of more than secondary importance. A graphic account of the
whole proceedings connected with his call to the ministry, together with a report of his first sermon in St. Andrews, will be found in Knox's History of the Reformation.

At this time he was residing in the Castle of St. Andrews. After Beaton's death, this stronghold became a place of refuge for many of the Protestants. Along with his pupils, the sons of the lairds of Longniddry and Ormiston, already mentioned, he passed there some comparatively peaceful months. His reposè was rudely interrupted by the investiture and capitulation of the castle in the end of July, 1547, succeeded, as regarded Knox and some of the rest of the refugees, by imprisonment in the French galleys. He now spent no less than nineteen months as a galley-slave, amongst hardships and miseries which are said to have permanently injured his health, and which he never cared to refer to, so painful was the recollection. "How long I continued prisoner," he said in a sermon preached in St. Andrews, in 1569, "what torments I sustained in the galleys, and what were the sores of my heart, is now no time to recite." He adds, however, that he always continued to hope for a return to his native country. In the History (vol. i. p. 228), the same confidence of a return is referred to as never having forsaken him; and he gives a curious testimony to the fact, by mentioning how, on one occasion, "lying betwixt Dundee and St. Andrews, the second time that the galleys returned to Scotland, the said John [Knox] being so extremely sick that few hoped his life, Maister [afterwards Sir] James [Balfour, one of his fellow-prisoners] willed him to look to the land, and asked if he knew it. Who answered, 'Yes, I know it well; for I see the steeple of that place where God first in public opened my mouth to his glory; and I am fully persuaded, how weak soever I now appear, that I shall not depart this life, till that my tongue shall glorify his godly name in the same place.'"

On his release, which took place early in 1549, through (as is supposed) the mediation of Edward VI., Knox found, that, in the existing state of the country, he would be of little use in his beloved Scotland. For nearly ten years we accordingly find him submitting to voluntary exile, like so many of the worthiest of his countrymen in those troublous times. All these years, however, he devoted himself to ministerial labors in connection with the Reformed Church. His first sphere of duty was provided for him in England, as a minister of the English Church. For a full account of this period (extending over about five years) of the life of Knox, the reader must be referred to Dr. Lorimer's work, mentioned below. That the father of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland should have been from 1549 to 1554 a minister of the Church of England will appear the less remarkable, when it is remembered, that, during the whole reign of Edward VI., the Church of England was in a transition state; some of its most marked peculiarities (which Knox himself and others in Scotland had afterwards objected to) being then in abeyance, or at least not insisted upon as terms of communion. Thus, the Prayer-Book was not obligatory, neither was kneeling at the communion. Episcopal government was of course acknowledged; but Knox, when himself offered, in the year 1552, the bishopric of Rochester, declined the prebendary, on the same grounds on which he afterwards objected to the re-introduction of Episcopacy into Scotland. The offices he held in the Church of England are roughly indicated in the History, which says, "He was first appointed preacher to Berwick, then to Newcastle, and last he was called to London and to the southern parts of England, where he remained till the death of Edward VI." (Works, I. p. 280). From other sources it appears that in 1551 he was appointed one of the six chaplains in ordinary to the king; and that in this capacity he had submitted to him, and, after revial, joined the other chaplains in sanctioning, "The Articles concerning an Uniformity in Religion" of 1552, which became the basis of the "Thirty-nine Articles" of the Church of England.

From England, at the death of Edward, Knox proceeded to the Continent, travelling for a time from place to place with uncertainty. In September, 1554, having reached Geneva, where he saw Calvin, he accepted a call to the English Church at Frankfurt. At Frankfurt controversies in connection with vestments, ceremonies, and the use of the English Prayer-Book, met him, and, notwithstanding the great moderation which he showed from first to last, led, in March, 1555, to his resignation of his charge. On this subject the reader is referred to his treatise, reprinted in Laing's edition of Knox's works, entitled A Breve Narrative of the Troubles which arose at Frankfurt (1554). From Frankfurt, Knox passed a second time to Geneva, where he was at once invited to become minister of the English Church; and to that charge he was formally elected in December, 1555, on his return from a visit which he paid to Scotland on the occasion of his first marriage. The church in which he preached at Geneva was called the "Temple de Notre Dame la Neuve," and had been granted, at Calvin's solicitation, for the use of the English and Italian congregations, by the municipal authorities of that city. Knox continued to officiate in Geneva till January, 1556, when he finally left for Scotland.

He arrived in Edinburgh on the 2d of May of that year. The time was a critical one: but the life of Knox from this period belongs to the history of his country, and only those particulars need be noticed which have a strictly personal interest.

When the Reformed religion was, in 1560, formally ratified by law in Scotland, Knox was appointed minister of the Church of St. Giles, then the great parish church of Edinburgh. He was at this time a man of fifty-five years, and in the full vigor of his powers, as appears abundantly in the style of his History of the Reformation,— a work which appears to have been begun about 1559, and completed in the course of the next five or six years. The History, if sometimes rough and even coarse in language, and not always defensible in temper and spirit, is written with a force and vigor not surpassed by any of his other writings; and abroad afterwards objected to being then in abeyance, or at least not insisted upon as terms of communion. Thus, the Prayer-Book was not obligatory, neither was kneeling at the communion. Episcopal government was of course acknowledged; but Knox,
misfortune, to lose his much-loved wife, Marjory Bowes, the only one in his twentysixth year. She was the daughter of Richard Bowes, captain of Norham Castle, and a scion of a family of distinction in Northumberland. He had secured her affections during his early ministry at Berwick, and had returned from Geneva in 1556 to marry her. In 1563 Knox made a second marriage, which was greatly talked of at the time, not so much for the difference of rank, as the disparity in age, between the parties, but which, notwithstanding these circumstances, appears to have been a happy one. The young lady was Margaret Stewart, daughter of Andrew Lord Stewart of Ochiltree. At this time our reformer lived not only a very laborious life,—being much engrossed with the public affairs of the nascent church, and at the same time devoted to his work as a parish minister, to say nothing of his continual, and perhaps, in his position, unavoidable controversies, more or less personal, with the ecclesiastical and political factions of the day, whom he regarded as his own and his country’s enemies,—but a life not without its social and family enjoyments. He had a fair stipend of four hundred marks Scots, equal to about forty-four pounds of English money of that day, and the value of which may be computed when it is stated that the amount was considerably higher than that of the salaries of the judges of the Court of Session in Scotland, and not much lower than those of the English judges of the same times. Then he had a good house, which was provided and kept in repair by the municipality,—a house previously occupied by the abbot of Dunfermline. The house is still preserved, with little change, and forms a memorial,—hitherto the only memorial,—of the great reformer in the scene of so many of his labors. From his will, too, it appears that he had sometimes as much as a hoghead of wine in his cellar. Nor was he, with all his severity and even fierceness of temper, a man indisposed in those days to exchange friendly and kindly relations with his neighbors, many of whom, in every rank, were among his intimate friends, or to give way, when the occasion demanded, to grief and trouble when it was but just, to mirth and humor, of which, as of other traits of his character, his writings furnish abundant evidence.

An interesting description of Knox’s appearance, and especially of his style as a preacher, in his later years, is furnished in the Diary of James Melville (Bannatyne Club, 1829, pp. 26, 33). Melville was at the time a student in St. Andrews, and the period he refers to is the year 1571, when Knox, for his personal security, had, not for the first time in his life, taken refuge in that city. “Of all the benefits I had that year” (writes Melville) “was the coming of that most notable prophet and apostle of our nation, Mr. John Knox, to St. Andrews, who, by the faction of the queen occupying the castle and town of Edinburgh, was compelled to remove therefrom, with a number of the best, and chose to come to St. Andrews, the residence of Mr. Knox, in, and repose him in our college-yard, and call us scholars unto him, and bless us, and exhort us to know God and his work in our country, and stand by the good cause; to use our time well, and learn the good instructions, and follow the good example, of our master.” He was very weak. I saw him every day of his doctrine go hulie and fear, with a furring of matriks about his neck, a staff in the one hand, and a good godly Richard Ballantyne, his servant, holding up the other oxtar, from the abbey to the parish church, and by the said Richard and another servant lifted up to the pulpit, where he sat, and remained at his first entry; but or he had done with his sermon, he was so active and vigorous that he was like to ding that pulpit in blads and fly out of it.”

John Knox died on Monday, the 24th of November, 1572, in the sixtieth year of his age. He died as he had lived,—full of faith, but always ready for conflict. He found a devoted nurse in his young wife; and all the noblest and best men of Scotland hung about his house for tidings of the progress of his malady, in the vain hope of his being longer spared. Two brief estimates of his character, both of them contemporary, may be here added. One is found in the account of his last illness and death by his servant, Richard Ballantyne, who, after detailing the incidents of his last hours, says, “Of this manner departit this man of God, the lyacht of Scotland, the comfort of the Kirk within the same, the mirror of Godliness, and patrone and example to all trew ministeris, in puritie of lyfe, soundness in doctrine, and in bauldness in re—proving of wicketness, and one that cairred not the favore of men (how great soever they were) to reprove their abuses and synges. . . . What dexteritie in teiching, bauldness in reproofing, and hatred of wickedness was in him, my igno—rant dulness is not able to declar.”

But the highest testimony to the worth of a man not without fault was that pronounced at his grave in the churchyard of St. Giles by the Earl of Mortoun, the regent of Scotland, in the presence of an immense concourse, who had followed him to his last resting-place: “Here lyeth a man who in his life never feared the face of man, who hath been often threatened with dagge and dagger, but yet hath ended his days in peace and honour.”


KNOX, Vicesimus, b. at Newington Green, Middlesex, Dec. 8, 1752; d. in Tunbridge, Kent, Sept. 6, 1821. He was educated at St. John’s College, Oxford; succeeded his father as master of Tunbridge School, and held the position with honor for thirty-three years. He is well known as the author of Essays (London, 1777); more than twenty editions published, and a thirteenth edition of Elegant Extracts in Prose (1783), Elegant Extracts in Verse (1790), Elegant Epistles (1782) (the three volumes reprinted, Boston, Mass., 6 vols.), and of Family Lectures, 1791. He was an admired
KOHATH. 1260

preacher, impassioned and flowery. His Works, with biographical preface, were published, London, 1824, 7 vols.

KOHATH (assembly), second son of Levi (Gen. xlii. 11), founder of the Kohathites (1 Chron. xxiii. 12), who were Levites of the highest rank. According to the account in Num. iii. 20-31, iv. 2 sq., the Kohathites pitched their tents on the south side of the tabernacle while in the wilderness, and had charge of "the ark and the table, and the candlestick, and the altars, and the vessels of the sanctuary wherewith they minister, and the hanging, and the service thereof." In later times they helped to bring the ark to Jerusalem (1 Chron. xv. 5). They had twenty-three cities assigned to them at the conquest (Josh. xxii. 4, 5). They occupied the proudest positions in the land, being judges and officers (1 Chron. xxv. 20-28), also temple-singers (2 Chron. xx. 19). See LEVITES.

KOHLBRÜGGE, Hermann Friedrich, the founder of the Dutch-Reformed (Niederländisch-Reformierte) congregation at Elberfeld; b. in Amsterdam, Aug. 15, 1803; d. at Elberfeld, March 5, 1875. His parents were Lutherans; and, after studying theology, he became preacher to a Lutheran congregation in Amsterdam. But between the cold rationalism of his colleagues and his own hot enthusiasm, a conflict was unavoidable, and he was deposed. After living for several years in retirement, he joined the Reformed Church; and in 1834, while travelling through the Rhine regions, where just at that time a kind of revival took place, he preached often, and made a deep impression. But the Prussian Government, considering him a dangerous enemy of their plans of uniting the Lutheran and Reformed churches, finally forbade him the pulpit. Meanwhile the act of union produced a great fermentation, especially among the Reformed congregations; and that of Elberfeld finally separated from the State establishment, and chose Kohlbrügge for its minister (1847), constituting itself as a member of the Church of the Netherlands. There he labored with great success till his death. Besides a considerable number of sermons, he published, Das siebente Kapitel des Briefes Pauli an die Römer; Betrachtung über d. erste Kapitel d. Evangeliums nach Matthäus, etc. CALAMINUS.

KOHLER, Christian and Hieronymus, two brothers, natives of Brugglen, a village in the canton of Bern, and founders of the so-called "Brugglen" sect, which flourished about the middle of the eighteenth century. Badly educated, but not without considerable natural gifts, sensuous, shrewd, with an inclination towards the marvellous and mystical, Christian supported himself as a common day-laborer, and Hieronymus as a wagoner. Neither of them seems to have led a blameless life: nevertheless, when, in 1746, a revival movement reached the country in which they lived, they succeeded in placing themselves at the head of the movement. They left off working, and began to preach and exhort. They had visions and revelations. They represented themselves as the two witnesses of the Revelation. They asserted that Christian was the temple of the Father; Hieronymus, that of the Son; and Kissling, a woman of not altogether irreproachable reputation, that of the Holy Spirit, destined to bring forth the Saviour of the world. Their doctrines, so far as they had any doctrines, were a mere maze of willful distortions, intended to justify the immorality of their own lives. But they, nevertheless, succeeded in seducing quite a number of people in Brugglen and the neighboring parishes. Jan. 2, 1750, they were banished from Bern; but they secretly returned, obtained money to release deceased souls from purgatory, allured people into idleness and debauchery by predicting the near end of the world, etc. Oct. 8, 1752, Hieronymus was arrested; and Jan. 16, 1753, he was sentenced to death, and executed. At the same time Christian was arrested at Neuenburg; but his final fate is unknown. Kissling was locked up in a house of correction. Shortly after, the sect disappeared, though it is noticeable that afterwards the Antonians found ready acceptance in the very parishes in which the Brugglen sect had flourished. See KYBURZ: Das entdeckte Geheimnis der Boesheit in der Brüggler-Sekte, Zurich, 1753, 2 vols.

KOLLENBUSCH, Samuel, b. at Wichlingenhausen, near Barmen, Sept. 1, 1724; d. at Barmen, Sept. 1, 1803. He studied medicine at Duisburg and Strassburg, and practised as a physician, first at Duisburg, afterwards in his native city. As a mystic, he stands between Tersteegen and Jung-Stilling. But he was a biblical realist, believing in the literal truth of every word of the Bible, and a zealous churchman; and this same character the circle of adherents retained, which gradually formed around him, and which afterwards was considerably widened by the exertions of G. Menken at Bremen. For his peculiar doctrines, see Erklärung bibliischer Wahrheiten (Elberfeld, 1807), and Goldene Apfel in silbernen Schalen (Barmen, 1854): for his life, see Mittheilungen aus d. Leben u. Wirken S. Kollenbusch in Barmen (Barmen, 1853). See also W. KRUG: Die Lehre d. Dr. Kollenbusch (Elberfeld, 1846) and Kritische Geschichte d. protest-relig. Schiürmerie im Grossherz. Berg (Elberfeld, 1861), and M. GOEBEL: Gesch. d. christ. Lebens u. kirch. Westphal. evang. Kirche, Coblenz, 1849-1860, 3 vols. (1st vol. 'Introduction). M. GOEBEL.

KOL NIDR (Tie-5;), "all vows," a formula uttered three times, with increasing loudness, by the official leader of worship in the Jewish synagogues, upon the evening of the Day of Atonement, as part of the service. Each time it is pronounced, the congregation repeat it softly. It is to this effect: "All vows, renunciations, prohibitions, and obligations of every kind, which we have made, sworn, and bound upon us, from this Day of Atonement to the next, we now repent of, and pronounce them broken, and of no efficacy. Our vows are no vows: our oaths are no oaths." As might be supposed, this liturgical formula has been turned against the Jews, as if by it they absolved themselves from obligations, and therefore could not be bound by an oath. But the charge is unjust; for the Kol Nidré applies only to vows, "i.e., what the speaker binds upon himself, and not to oaths, which would bind him to others. The latter are regarded by them as inviolable, except by the personal consent of the individual who had received the oath. A general release from future vows can be made on New Year, or between New Year's and the Day of
KONRAD OF MARBURG

KONRAD OF MARBURG, one of the most notorious names in German church history; was b. at Marburg in the second half of the twelfth century; and killed there July 30, 1233. Of his personal life very little is known. It is doubtful whether he ever studied in any university, though he bore the title of magister, and it cannot be ascertained whether he was a secular priest, or belonged to one of the religious orders. When he first appeared in history, at the court of landgrave Ludwig IV. of Thuringia and Hesse, during the reign of Pope Honorius III., he was highly praised for his zeal and disinterestedness. But during the latter part of his life, after the death of Ludwig IV. and Honorius III., when the widowed landgravine Elizabeth made him her spiritual guardian, and Gregory IX. appointed him inquisitor-general of Germany, his virtues, if ever he had any, turned into so many vices. The treatment to which he subjected the landgravine, in order to produce a saint, is utterly disgusting and revolting. He succeeded, however. She died in 1231, twenty-four years old, and was canonized in 1235. Equally revolting, and utterly detestable, were the methods he employed as inquisitor-general,—espionage and denunciations, no procedure and no apparatus, no conviction by the aid of the secular power, or by his own tools, generally chosen among robbers and incendiaries. None escaped him, neither priest nor knight, neither bishop nor king. On July 25, 1233, King Henry convened a great assembly of princes and bishops at Mayence; and the assembly insisted upon the organization of a regular procedure. Konrad refused, and the bishops addressed themselves to the Pope. On his return to Marburg, Konrad was killed; and the Pope fulminated. But so great was the hatred which Konrad had produced, that at the diet of Frankfort, in February, 1234, none dared to take his cause or that of the Pope; and though heavy penalties were imposed upon his murderers, and his remains were buried beside those of St. Elizabeth, the papal inquisition was not re-established.
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in Germany any more. The punishment of heretics was again laid under the jurisdiction of the bishops. See Elizabeth, St., and Inquisition.

Lit.—The life of Konrad of Marburg has been written by Stättler (Aschen, 1857), Kopp (Marburg, 1861), Harmsrath (Marburg, 1861), Beck (1871), Cuno (1877), and Kaltner (Prag, 1882). See also the literature under St. Elizabeth.

St. Elizabeth.

KOOLHAAS, Kaspar, b. at Cologne, 1356; d. at Leyden, 1815. He studied at Dusseldorf, but embraced the Reformation in 1566, and was in 1571 made professor of theology at Leyden, from which position, however, he afterwards retired. His De jure Christiani magistratus circa disciplinam et regimen ecclesiae gave great offence; and the synod of Mittelburg (1581) demanded that he should retract, and subscribe to the Belgian Confession. When he refused, and appealed to the states-general, the provincial synod of Holland communicated him, 1582; but the magistrate of Leyden supported him, and he lived undisturbed in the city as a private teacher. He held with respect to church government, predestination, etc., nearly the same views as afterwards Arminius.

A. Schweizer.

KOPPE, Johann Benjamin, b. at Danzig, Aug. 19, 1750; d. at Hanover, Feb. 12, 1791. He studied theology and philology at Leipzig and Göttingen, and was appointed professor of theology at Göttingen in 1776, superintendent-general of Gotha in 1784, and court-preacher at Hanover in 1788. As a pupil of Érnesti and Heyne, and transferring their grammatico-historical principle to the exegesis of the New Testament, he began the publication of his Novum Testamentum Gr. perpet. annotat. illustr. in 1778, but he finished only the Epistles to the Galatians, Thessalonians, and Ephesians. The work was continued by Tychsen, Ammon, Heinrichs, and Pott.

G. H. Klippel.

KO'RAH, a son of Izhar (Exod. vi. 15, 21, 24), and leader of the rebellion against Moses and Aaron (Num. xvi. xxvi. 9, xxvii. 3). See Moses.

Jude (11) couples Korah with Cain and Balaam in his warnings against false and self-seeking teachers.

KORAHITES, sons, i.e., descendants, of Korah, prince of the Kohathite family of the priests, the descendants of Kohath, a son of Levi (Exod. vi. 16, 18, 21). Some of them were noted singers (2 Chron. xx. 19). Eleven of the psalms (xl. xxxiv.-xxxix., lxxxi., lxxxi. vii., lxxxi. viii.) are headed, "For the sons of Korah;" so that probably the "sons of Korah" became, in course of time, a descriptive term for the temple-singers. Others of the Korahites were doorkeepers (1 Chron. ix. 17-19); while one, Mattithiah, "had the set office over the things that were made in the pews" (ix. 31), i.e., the minchah, or meat-offering of the temple, offered daily in the morning and evening (cf. Lev. ii. 5, 6, vi. 14).

KORAN. See MohamMed.

KORTHAL, a religious community in Württemberg, seven miles from Stuttgart, was founded by, and became the rallying-point of, Württemberg Pietism in the early part of this century. The Pietism of Württemberg, which had among its principal advocates J. A. Bengel (d. 1752) and Oetinger (d. 1782), developed, and was in turn affected by, the original and energetic mind of a peasant, Michael Hahn. The latter had a following [of at least fifteen thousand people]; and when, in 1810, the government determined to introduce a new hymn-book and a rationalizing literature into the community, in spite of the opposition of the Pietists, many of them emigrated to Southern Russia. Soon after his accession, King William sought to stem the tide of emigration, and in 1818 called upon Gottlieb Wilhelm Hoffmann, the mayor of Leonberg, to draw up a plan of pietistic communities such as Hoffmann himself, a year before, had proposed, in a document addressed to his Majesty. The king fell in with the general idea, and on Sept. 8, 1818, published an edict granting toleration to a colony such as was proposed. The following year a number of families, taking advantage of the edict, purchased the Goritz estate of Kornthal (a thousand acres for a hundred and thirteen thousand gulden, or fifty thousand dollars); and on Nov. 7, 1819, the church was dedicated. Michael Hahn was chosen as the first president (Vorsichter), but died a few days after his election, and was succeeded by Hoffmann, who, after a very successful administration, died in 1846. It soon called a pastor. Friedrich von Winzerhausen, who was succeeded in 1833 by Dr. v. Kappf, who subsequently became one of the most eminent preachers of the land, and pastor of the Stiftskirche in Stuttgart. He was succeeded by Pfarrer Staudt, who is still active. The colony sought to realize the ideal of a corporation of Christians; and Hoffmann, who was largely influenced by the institutions of the Moravians, determined to make it also a model of agricultural and mechanical thrift and educational institutions. It did not become schismatic, but adopted the Augsburg Confession, with only a few omissions. However, it was stipulated, in the royal act of incorporation, that it should be independent of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Württemberg, and enjoy the absolute right to manage its own church-mattera. It secured the power to banish any person from the community, the corporation purchasing back his tract of land. The original statutes also extend the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the corporation to matters of dress, food, etc. Chilastic views were very prevalent in the community, and the second coming was expected to occur in 1836. After that date, the town assumed a more permanent aspect. In 1824, at the request of the king, Kornthal founded an offshoot in Northern Württemberg, Wilhelmsdorf, which enjoyed the same privileges as the mother, but was not so successful, and in 1852 voluntarily resigned its charter.

The community has served its purpose well, and stands forth as a model corporation. There are no lawsuits, no children born out of wedlock, no drinking-bouta, no intemperance, no blasphemers, [Church-attendance is universal, and the two services on the sabbath are always crowded. The church then presents a singularly interesting appearance. The pastor sits in the centre of the bench, behind the pulpit, with the elders of the town on each side of him. The little children all sit on the steps of the pulpit platform, facing the congregation,—the young women on the right of the pulpit, and the young men on the left. Each, from the smallest child up to the young men, has a
paper and pencil in hand, with which they make notes of the sermon, and on which they are examined during the week by the pastor. The young people are obligated to attend the services; and, after the sermon, the pastor passes down on one side, and the chief magistrate on the other, and call out the roll of the young men and women. Absences must be accounted for during the week.

A beautiful Easter custom is in vogue among the Kornthalers, by which the men meet six o'clock in the graveyard, and, after music from trumpets, sing a hymn, and engage in prayer. Nothing to jar the repose of the community occurs. Even petty crimes are unknown, and the whole atmosphere is freighted with the calm of a serious and devout religiousness. There is only one inn in the place; and that is patronized but very seldom by the people, who constitute one of the ideal temperance societies in the world. The contrast which Kornthal presents to the neighboring communities is very marked, both in point of piety and intelligence of the people and their general thrift and diligence. The town has been celebrated for its schools; and a number of English and American boys have received their German education in the Knaben-Institut, until recently presided over by Professor Pfleiderer. Kornthal is prettily located in the midst of vineyards and richly cultivated fields, and has a population of about nine hundred.


KORTHOLT, Christian, b. at Borg, in the Island of Femern, Jan. 15, 1832; d. at Kiel, March 31, 1894. He studied at Rostock, Jena, Leipzig, and Wittenberg, and was appointed professor of Greek at Rostock in 1852, and professor of theology at Kiel in 1858. His great reputation as a church historian he owes, not so much to his Hist. Eccl., Leipzig, 1856, and Diagnosiones Ant. Bononiæ u. Kiel, 1860; De canone (against Bellarmine), Kiel, 1860; but to his huge historical works,—Ordo missæ secundum ritum ecclesiae Hamburghensis (Strassburg, 1859), and Spirantissimum opusculum in officium missæ (edited, after his lectures, by Bertold Möller, 1866); but his literary fame he owes to his historical works,—Vandalia (1518), Saxonia (1520), Dania (1546), and Metropolis (1548), published after his death, and containing many precious materials to the church history of his time. When, on his death-bed, he read the theses of Luther, he exclaimed, "Alas! my good brother, you had better go back to your cell, and sing a misereor. The thing is too big. It cannot be done." Clement VIII. put his historical works on the Index. See Leben d. Albert Krantz, Hamburg, 1722, 2d ed., 1729; JOHANNES MÖLLER: Cimbria Literata, iii. pp. 376-391. CARL BERTHEAU.

KRAFFT, Johann Christian Gottlob Ludwig, b. at Duisburg, Dec. 12, 1784; d. at Erlangen, May 15, 1845. He studied theology at Duisburg, and was for several years a private tutor in France-for-the-Main. In 1806 he became pastor of the Reformed congregation at Weeze, near Cleve; and in 1817 he was appointed pastor of the Reformed congregation at Erlangen, and, in the following year, professor of theology in the university. His works consist of several collections of sermons, an essay, De servo et libero arbitrio (Nuremberg, 1818), and Chronologie und Harmonie der vier Evangelien, edited, after his death by Dr. Burger, Erlangen, 1848. The great influence, however, which he exercised, was due less to his writings than to his lectures, and, again, less to his teaching than to his person. He was "a truly apostolical character," his very appearance, "a silent sermon on the strength of God within him." He imparted new life to the Protestant Church in Bavaria, which had sunk into insipid rationalism; and, long before the name of "inner missions" ever was heard of, he performed the work far and wide. He was the first German professor who delivered a course of lectures on the history of missions. See Thomasius: D. Widerwechs. d. evang. Lebens in d. Luth. Kirche Bayerns, Erlangen, 1857. E. GOEBEL.

KRALIZ, a castle in Moravia, celebrated as the place where the first Bohemian translation of the Bible was made from the original text, the preceding ones having been made from the Vulgate. This translation (the Bible of Kraliz) was issued in six volumes in folio, 1579-93, and is still reprinted by foreign Bible societies. But specimens of the original work are very scarce; as, during the counter-reformation in Bohemia, the Jesuits destroyed every copy they could lay their hands on.

KRAUTZ, Albert, b. at Hamburg about 1445; d. there Dec. 7, 1517. He studied theology, philosophy, and history at Rostock and Cologne; travelled in Germany and Italy; lectured on philosophy and canon law in the university of Rostock, whose rector he was in 1492; and settled in 1498 in his native city, first as secretary, then as primarius theologice at the cathedral, then as dean of the chapter. He was often employed by the magistrate of Hamburg in diplomatical negotiations, and in 1500 he was chosen arbitrator between King Hans of Denmark and Duke Frederick of Holstein. During his lifetime he published several theological works,—Ordo missæ secundum ritum ecclesiae Hamburghensis (Strassburg, 1509), and Spirantissimum opusculum in officium missæ (edited, after his lectures, by Bertold Möller, 1506); but his literary fame he owes to his historical works,—Vandalia (1518), Saxonia (1520), Dania (1546), and Metropolis (1548), published after his death, and containing many precious materials to the church history of his time. When, on his death-bed, he read the theses of Luther, he exclaimed, "Alas! my good brother, you had better go back to your cell, and sing a misereor. The thing is too big. It cannot be done." Clement VIII. put his historical works on the Index. See Leben d. Albert Krantz, Hamburg, 1722, 2d ed., 1729; JOHANNES MÖLLER: Cimbria Literata, iii. pp. 376-391. CARL BERTHEAU.

KRAUSINSKI, Count Valerian, b. about 1780; d. Dec. 22, 1855. A Protestant by faith, he held a position in the department of public instruction when the insurrection of 1830 took place in Warsaw, and was, by the provisory government, sent to England as a member of its embassy to St. James. The speedy suppression of the rebellion prevented him from ever returning home. He remained in England, residing, first in London, and afterwards in Edinburgh, and occupying himself with literary pursuits. He wrote, among other works, The Rise, Progress, and Decline of the Reformation in Poland (London, 1839-1840, 2 vols.), and Lectures on the Religious History of the Slavonian Nations (Edinburgh, 1851).

KRAUTH, Charles Philip, D.D., American Lutheran divine; b. in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, May 7, 1797; d. in Gettysburg, May 30, 1867; entered the ministry 1827, was called to Philadelphia 1827, and elected professor of biblical and Oriental literature in the theological seminary at Gettysburg 1833, and president of Pennsylvania College, in the same place, the next year; discharged the duties of these two
of its details are very obscure. It ended with his condemnation; and, long before that time, every vestige of his propaganda for Crypto-Calvinism had been completely obliterated. See Richard: Dr. Nicholas Krell, Dresden, 1859, 2 vols.; Robert Calinch: Zwei sächs. Kanzler, Chemnitz, 1888. Oswald Schmidt.

Krüdener, Barbara Juliane, Baroness von, b. at Riga, Nov. 21, 1764; d. at Karasu-Bazar, Dec. 25, 1824. A daughter of a Russian statesman (von Wietinghoff), she was married to another Russian statesman (von Krüdener) when she was fourteen years old. The marriage proved unhappy, and in 1792 she separated from her husband. She settled in Paris, led a very frivolous life, which she has described in a novel, Valerie. An accident, the sudden death of one of her lovers, converted her. She became religious. She was no doubt sincere, but an enthusiast without self-control. In 1815 she became acquainted with the Emperor, Alexander I., and their intercourse was very intimate. She exercised great influence on him. She gave the Holy Alliance its name. During the two years of famine, 1816–17, she was a great support to many poor people in Switzerland and Southern Germany. But even her charity showed so peculiar and so eccentric a character, that it gave offence, and in 1818 she was actually transported home to Russia by the police. Meanwhile the friendship of Alexander I. had grown rather cold; and, when she openly denounced his lukewarmness in the affairs of Greece, he ordered her to leave St. Petersburg. She was on her way to the Crimea, with the Princess Gallitzin and a number of German colonists, when she died. See Ch. Eynard: Vie de Mme. de Krüdener, Paris, 1849, 2 vols.; Sternberg: Leben d. Frau von Krüdener, Leipzig, 1856; M. Zirze: Juliane von Krüdener, New York, 1887. See also Sainte-Beuve: Portraits de femmes et Derniers Portraits.

Krug, Wilhelm Traugott, b. at Radis, near Wittenberg, June 22, 1770; d. at Leipzig, Jan. 13, 1842. He studied at Wittenberg, and was appointed professor of philosophy there in 1804, at Francfort-publishing a new edition of the German Bible, with Calvinistic notes on the margin, the so-called "Krell's Bible;" the latter drawing up a new catechism of the same character. The supreme consistory at Dresden was abolished, and a severe censorship of theological books was established. Finally, July 4, 1801, the exorcism was erased from the baptismal formula, but thereby the popular conscience was touched; and a citizen of Dresden, a butcher, met at the baptismal font, and demanded, with the axe raised over against the neck of the minister, to have his child baptized with exorcism. The chancellor's religious predilections also made themselves felt in his foreign policy. He supported the Huguenots in France, but the campaign was disastrous; and when, in the summer of 1801, the troops returned, he had no money to pay them. At that moment the elector died (Sept. 25, 1801); and thus he was immediately dismissed by Duke Friedrich Wilhelm of Saxe-Altenburg, guardian of the infant heir, and imprisoned in the Königstein. A process was instituted against him, which lasted for ten years, but which has no religious interest. Many
KRUMMACHER, Friedrich Wilhelm, a son of the former; one of the most eloquent and influential preachers of Germany in this century; was b. Jan. 28, 1796, at Mörs on the Rhine, the birthplace of the fervid German hymn-writer, Tersteegen; d. Dec. 10, 1868, at Frankfort. He graduated at the university of Halle from 1815 to 1817 (where he heard the lectures of the extreme rationalist, Wegscheider, and the modest but devout Knapp), and at Jena. In 1819 he became the assistant pastor of the Reformed congregation at Frankfort; the next year he accepted a call from the village of Ruhrort. Two years subsequently, in 1825, he removed to Bar- men in the Wupperthal. It was here, at a week day evening service, that he delivered his lectures on Elijah and Elisha. Crowded congregations listened to them, large numbers coming from the neighboring city of Elberfeld. In 1834 he was called for the second time to Elberfeld, and accepted. During his residence in this city, he received a delegation from the synod of Pennsylvania, of the German Reformed Church, consisting of Dr. Hoffeditz and the Rev. Dr. Schneck, extending to him a call to a chair in the theological seminary at Mercersburg. He finally decided to decline the position, but directed the attention of the delegation to Dr. Schaff, then a privat docent at Berlin, who accepted the call (in 1844).

Krummacher exerted a wide and beneficent influence in the Wupperthal, and his affections became deeply rooted in its soil; and in 1847 he followed with reluctance a call, as Marheinecke's successor, at the Trinity Church, Berlin, to which position he had been appointed by King Frederick William IV. He continued to labor there, entering heartily into the religious circles of the city, and preaching the gospel of repentance and faith, undaunted by the wide diffusion of rationalism, until 1853, when he was appointed court-chaplain at Potsdam. He sustained a relation of great intimacy with the king. Dr. Krummacher took a lively interest in the Evangelical Alliance; was present at the conference in London, 1851, and at every succeeding conference, till his death. From the conference of Paris he wrote, "I became in Paris young again as an eagle. . . . It was the kingdom of God in blessed consecration." He was one of the most earnest promotors of the conference in Berlin, 1857. In 1862 he accepted the invitation of Queen Victoria, as one of the ministers to preach in their own language at the London Exposition. Dr. Krummacher was a fervid and bold preacher of the gospel, and takes his place among the most famous preachers of his time. From the pulpit of his day in Germany. He was on intimate terms with the Hofacksers and Albert Knapp, the fervent evangelical preachers of Southern Germany, as well as with the pious men in the pulpits and at the universities of Northern Germany; had a broad interest in the cause of evangelical religion in other lands; and numbered among his friends Adolphe Monod and others of the best spirits of France and Great Britain. Dr. Schaff, in a letter to The New-York Observer (Feb. 4, 1869), says, "Krummacher was endowed with every gift that constitutes an orator, — a most fertile and brilliant imagination, a vigorous and original mind, a glowing heart, an extraordinary facility and felicity of diction, perfect familiarity with the Scriptures, an athletic and commanding presence, and a powerful and melodious voice, which, however, in latter years, underwent a great change, and sounded like the rolling of the distant thunder. They always shine as one of the brightest stars in the galaxy of those great and good men, who, in the present century, have fought the good fight of the evangelical faith against prevailing rationalism and infidelity, and have entitled themselves to the gratitude and the future generations." Thorwaldsen, the great sculptor, meeting Krummacher in Frankfurt at the seventieth anniversary of Goethe's birth, was attracted by his noble forehead and appearance, and asked, "Are you an artist?"—"No, a theologian," was the reply. To which the sculptor answered, "How can one be only a theologian!"

Krummacher is better known in England and America than any other German preacher: in fact, is the only one who is well known. He published a number of volumes of sermons, some of which have been translated into the English, and widely read. Of these volumes the principal are, Salomo und Sulamith, 1827, 9th ed., 1875; Elijah the Tishbite ("itself baptized with the fire of Elijah," as Heubner characterized this work), London, 1828, 6th ed., 1874 (English translation, London and New York, 1838, and many editions); The Prophet Eliaha, Elberfeld, 1836 (English translation, London); Das Passionsbuch, der leidende Christus, Bielefeld, 1854, 3d ed., 1878 (English translation, The Suffering Saviour, Edinburgh and Boston, 1870); David, the King of Israel, Berlin, 1887 (English translation, Edinburgh and New York, 1870). See Autobiography, edited by his daughter (English translation by M. G. Easton, 2d ed., Edinburgh, 1871), and art. in Herzog by Rud. Kögel.

KRUMMACHER, Gottfried Daniel, a younger brother of Friedrich Adolf; b. in Tecklenburg, April 1, 1774; d., as pastor of the Reformed Church, in Elberfeld, Jan. 30, 1837. After studying theology at Duisburg, he was successively pastor in Buer (1798), Wulfth (1801), and Elberfeld (1819). He was a man of some eccentricities, but a strong and robust Christian character and preacher. He was most zealous champion of the theology of the synod of Dort. His removal to Elberfeld occurred at a time of the universal awakening of religious thought in Germany, and aroused new life in his congregation. He drew the extreme conclusions from the doctrine of predestination; and some of his ardent followers disturbed the meeting with their cries of ridicule or dissent. Krummacher
for a while upheld this course of his followers, but gradually retreated from this position. However, under his influence a strong predestinarian party was formed in Elberfeld and the Wupperthal. He was strongly opposed to the efforts at church union, and in this was out of sympathy with the spirit of the Reformed Church. Among his printed volumes of sermons the most celebrated is a volume about the names of the camping-places of the Israelites in the desert: "D. Wanderungen Israels durch d. Wüste nach Kanaan, 1834.

KUINÖL (KÜHNÖL), Christian, one of the most widely learned of the rationalistic supernatural school of the closing part of the eighteenth century: b. at Leipzig, Jan. 2, 1768; d. at Giessen, Oct. 23, 1841. He studied theology and philology in his native city, and was appointed professor of philosophy there in 1790, and professor of theology at Giessen in 1799. His Commentaries on the Old Testament, Hoses, the Psalms, etc., are now antiquated; but his Commentaries in Chronicon Novum Testamenti historicos (Leipzig, 1807–18, 4 vols.) is, in spite of the somewhat dry and pedantic method, still a valuable work. [It was reprinted, along with the Greek text, in London, 1835, 3 vols.]

ZÜCKLER.

KUNZE, John Christopher, D.D., one of the most learned among the Lutheran theologians of this country; b. at Artern, Prussian Saxony, Aug. 4, 1744; d. at New York, July 24, 1807. Having finished his education as a student of theology at Leipzig, he was for three years employed as teacher of the higher branches in the reputed school at Closter-Bergen, near Magdeburg, and for one year as inspector of the Orphans-Home at Graiz, when, through the Rev. Dr. J. G. Knapp, superintendent of the Francke Institution at Halle, a call came to him from the Lutheran St. Michael's and Zion's congregations at Philadelphia, Penn. Setting sail for the New World, June 29, 1770, he entered his office as the third collegiate pastor of that congregation, Sept. 27 of the same year, and married, July 23, 1771, Margaret Henrietta, daughter of Rev. H. M. Mühlenberg, D.D., rector of the congregation, patriarch of the Lutheran Church in this country, whose successor in the office of rector he became A.D. 1779. Conscientious in the performance of his pastoral duties, he had an eye to the wants of the Church at large, opened a theological seminary, which the War of Independence brought to an untimely end, influenced the board of trustees of the College (before 1755 Academy, since 1779 University of Pennsylvania) in behalf of the special interests of the German language and students, and took a lively interest in the German Benevolent Society. A.D. 1784 he followed a call to the Lutheran congregation at New York, assisted in establishing the New-York University, served as one of the regents, and as professor of Oriental languages and literature. He belonged to the later Pietists, leaning to the so-called Supernaturalistic School. He was of very studious habits, and continually gathering solid information, whereof his diaries give ample evidence. He excelled in Arabic and Hebrew and in higher mathematics. The Redemptorist Party was formed in Elberfeld and the Wupperthal. He was strongly opposed to the efforts at church union, and in this was out of sympathy with the spirit of the Reformed Church. Among his printed volumes of sermons the most celebrated is a volume about the names of the camping-places of the Israelites in the desert: "D. Wanderungen Israels durch d. Wüste nach Kanaan, 1834.

M. GOEBEL.

KURTZ, a family of American Lutheran ministers.—John Nicholas, D.D., b. at Lutzeln, Nassau, Germany, about 1720; d. at Baltimore, Md., 1794. He was the first Lutheran minister ordained in the British colonies of America; labored from 1745 to 1790 as a missionary in Pennsylvania, often at the risk of his life. —John Daniel, D.D., son of the preceding; b. at Germantown, Penn., 1708; d. at Baltimore, Md., Dec. 29, 1865. He was pastor of the principal Lutheran Church of Baltimore (1788–1832), and one of the founders of the general synod of the Lutheran Church. —Benjamin, D.D., L.L.D., nephew of J. D. Kurtz; b. at Harrisburg, Penn., Feb. 28, 1795; d. at Baltimore, Md., Dec. 29, 1865. He edited the Lutheran Observer from 1833 to 1862; was one of the founders of the Gettysburg Theological Seminary (for which he collected funds and books in Germany), and in every way prominent in his denomination.

ZÖCKLER.

KYRIE ELEYSON. The prayer which in the Septuagint reads Ἐλέησον με, Θεί, "God, have mercy upon me!" (Ps. li.), or, Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κυρε, "Lord, have mercy upon us!" (Ps. cxviii.), and which in the New Testament (Matt. ix. 27, xx. 22, xx. 30; Mark x. 47) always is addressed to Jesus, the Son of David, very early became a fixed formula in the common church-prayer of the Greek Church. The Consti. Apost. (viii. 6) prescribes that the laity, especially the children, shall respond with a kyrie eleison to each single prayer of the litany recited by the deacon. At the time of Basil the Great the custom was generally adopted throughout the Greek Church, and it is still customary in all Oriental churches, to repeat the kyrie eleison over and over again, the choir singing it in Latin, the laity in the vernacular tongue. In the Roman Church, Pope Sylvester I. (314–335), is said to have first introduced the use of the Greek words. At the time of Felix V., when the council was held at Vaison (in 539), they were generally used throughout the Western Church. A Christe eleison was added, and the triple exclamation, Kyrie-christe, Kyrie eleison, was given in reference to the Holy Trinity. In 910 Pope Sergius ordered in his will, that, in those churches to which he had given donations, the priests should every day sing one hundred kyries and one hundred Christe eleisons. In the later middle ages, great pains were taken to expand the kyrie. In his Christliche Cultus, 2d ed., p. 493, Alt quotes, from a Roman missale of 1631, such an expanded kyrie, destined for the great festivals. After the Reformation, the kyrie eleison was retained in many Protestant churches.

H. MERZ.
LABADIE, Jean de, b. Feb. 13, 1610, at Bourg near Bordeaux; d. Feb. 13, 1674, at Altona. He was educated in the Jesuit college at Bordeaux; studied theology and philosophy, the Bible and the mystics, especially Augustine and St. Bernard; entered the order, but left it again in 1639, and began his practical career as a popular preacher in Bordeaux, Paris, and Amiens, where he was made a canon, and teacher of theology, in 1640. He made a deep impression by his preaching; but his passionate demands of reform, his sermons on freewill and predestination, on grace and good works, and his administration of the Lord's Supper in both forms, roused the hatred and persecutions of the Jesuits. Richelieu, however, protected him; but under Mazarin he was expelled from Amiens, and retired to the Carmelite hermitage at Graville. While there, he read Calvin's Institutions; and in 1650 — what has been told of his joining the Brethren of the Oratory, and afterwards the Jansenists, is unhistorical — he embraced the Reformed faith, and was appointed preacher, and professor of theology, at Montauban. He carried, however, his vivid reformatory instincts with him from the old into the new church; and though as pastor in Geneva, and afterwards at Middleburg, he contributed very much to the spiritual purification and moral elevation of the Reformed congregations, a separatist tendency became more and more apparent in his activity. Like all separatists, he dreamed of forming a congregation of saints. In 1668, when moving from Geneva to Middleburg, he formed a secret union with Pierre Yvon, Pierre Dulignon, and Francois Menuret, which was separatistic in its very character, and became the nucleus of the later Labadist sect. In Middleburg he refused to subscribe to the Belgian Confession, and recognize the authority of the synod. He was suspended from his office in 1668, and shortly after expelled from the city. On the invitation of the countess-palatine, Elizabeth, he settled at Herford with his followers, who already formed a completely organized body, separate from Church, with doctrines and a disciplinary system of their own, practising community of property, etc. At Herford a peculiar outburst of enthusiasm took place in the congregation; and, in spite of the intercession of Maurice of Orange and the elector of Brandenburg, the alarmed magistrate banished them from the city 1672. They removed to Altona, where they lived in peace for some time, and where Labadie died. Of his writings, many of which were translated into German, and much read among the Pietists and the Moravian Brethren, the principal are, La Prophétie (1688), Manuel de piété (1689), Protestation de bonne foi et saine doctrine (1670), Brève déclaration de nos sentiments touchant l'Église (1670).

Shortly after the death of their leader (1674) the war between Denmark and Sweden induced the Labadists to leave Altona. They settled at Wiewert in West Friesland, and while there they achieved their greatest success, in spite of the ill-will and chicaneries of the Frisian clergy. Their number increased from a hundred and fifty to about four hundred between 1675 and 1690. In 1680 they received an invitation from Cornelia van Sommelsdyk, the governor of Surinam, to found a colony in his dominions. The invitation was accepted with great enthusiasm. But in 1688 the governor was assassinated; and the colony, which had already been founded, soon died out. A similar attempt at New Bohemia, on the Hudson River, New-York State, U. S. A., also failed. It was, however, not so much these misfortunes, as internal difficulties arising from the abolition of community of property, which brought the sect to fall into decay. In 1703 only about thirty persons remained at Wiewert under the rigid discipline of Yvon.


LABADISTS. See above.

LABARUM (probably from the Basque, labarva, "a standard") is the name given to Constantine's modification of the ordinary cavalry standard (exzillum). The latter was a square piece of cloth stretched on top by a cross-bar, and suspended from a gilt spear surmounted by an eagle of victory. Before his victorious battle with Maxentius (312), in consequence of his vision of the cross, Constantine adopted the exzillum as the standard for the entire army; and he attributed his success to the fact that the battle was fought under this sign. In place of the eagle he put the monogram of Christ (see Christ, MONOGRAM OF), and on the banner, Christian emblems. He also appointed fifty of the " stoutest and most religious" of his soldiers to carry it by turns, and together constitute its special guard. It was a very happy inspiration on Constantine's part to take as the imperial ensign the labarum,— whose cruciform framework the Christians already regarded as emblematic of the cross of Christ, and which at the same time was greatly revered in its Pagan form by the soldiery,— and transform it into a religious symbol, "the saving sign of the Roman Empire;" for by this means he united enthusiastically the Christian and the Pagan elements in his army. Constantine's successors, except, of course, Julian, likewise adopted the labarum as their ensign. The word "labarum" was subsequently applied to the monogram, and even to the cross by itself. It is interesting to know that neither the word nor the thing dates from Constantine. See Smith and Cheetham, Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, s. v.

LABAT, Jean Baptiste, a French Dominican missionary and historian; b. in Paris 1663; d. there Jan. 6, 1738. He passed ten years in the
LACROIX.

West Indies, and wrote the valuable work, Nouveau voyage aux îles de l'Amérique, Paris, 1722, 6 vols.

LABBE, Philippe, b. at Bourges, July 10, 1807; entered the Jesuit order 1823; was for some time a teacher of philosophy and theology, but devoted the latter part of his life exclusively to literature, and d. in Paris, March 25, 1867. He wrote seventy-five different works, and is consequently the greatest and most valuable of his productions is his Concilein (Paris, 1872, 18 vols.), of which, however, only the eight first were edited by him, the rest, after his death, by Cossart. The work was reprinted at Venice, in 1728, by Nie. Colletti.

LA CHASSE, François de, b. in the castle of Aix, in the province of Forez, Aug. 25, 1824; d. at Versailles, Jan. 20, 1705. As a younger son of a noble family, he entered the order of the Jesuits; taught philosophy and theology with great success at Lyons and Grenoble; and was in 1647 appointed his professor to Louis XIV., in which position he exercised a great influence on all the affairs of the French Church,—the revocation of the Edict of Nantes and the dragonades, the controversy between Bossuet and Fénelon, the difficulties between the Pope and the king, etc. A man of polite manners and easy conscience of the king just as the king wished order. The ground near Paris which was given to him by the king, and on which he built his sumptuous villa, was afterwards transformed into a cemetery, which still bears his name, Père La Chaise. See R. de Chantelauze: Le Père de La Chaise, Lyons, 1859.

LACHELP (meincible), a Canaanitish city, was conquered by Joshua, and allotted to Judah. Jeroboam fortified it, and made it a place of great strength (2 Chron. xi. 9). On his way to Egypt, Sennacherib besieged it (2 Kings xviii. 13; Isa. xxxvi. 1); and a slab found in one of the chambers of the palace of Kouyunjik has been explained by Layard as representing Sennacherib laying siege to Lachish. See 2 Chron. xxxvi. 4; 2 Kings xix. 8; Jer. xxxvi. 7.

LACHMANN, Karl, b. at Brunswick, March 4, 1793; d. in Berlin, March 13, 1851. He studied at Leipzig and Göttingen, and was professor of philology, at first at Königsberg (1816), and afterwards in Berlin (1837). The restoration of old texts was the special object of his studies; and his editions of Lucretius, Propertius, and other classics, are celebrated. His editions of the Greek text of the New Testament (1831, 2d ed., 1842–1850, 2 vols.) show the experience and the principle of the master of classical criticism. His object was purely historical or diplomatic; namely to restore the oldest attainable text, the text of the fourth century, and that not as a final text, but simply as a sure historical basis for further operations of internal criticism. See his Life by Hertz, Berlin, 1854; and L. Schäfer, Conciliabula, pp. 253–256, and art. BIBLE-TEXT, p. 274.

LACORDAIRE, Jean Baptiste Henri, b. at Recey-sur-Ouche, in the department of Côte d'Or, March 12, 1802; d. at Sorreze, in the department of Tarn, Nov. 21, 1861. He studied law at Dijon and Paris, and began to practise as an advocate in the latter city. But roused by Lamennais' Ensay sur l'indéfance, and rapidly arriving at the conviction that Christianity (or, more precisely, the Roman-Catholic Church) is necessary for the social development of the human race, he entered the ecclesiastical seminary of St. Sulpice in 1824, and was ordained a priest in 1828. In 1831 and Montalembert, he placed himself at the head of the peculiar movement, which, under the device "God and liberty," demanded a close union between ultramontanism and radicalism, hierarchy and democracy, papal infallibility and universal suffrage. But the school which they opened in Paris, immediately after the outbreak of the revolution of 1830, in defiance of the privilege of the State university, was soon after closed by the police; and in 1831 their paper, L'Avenir, was condemned by the Pope. Lacordaire went to Rome, and submitted unconditionally. On his return from Rome, in July 1832, he was appointed preacher at the Cathedral of Notre Dame; and, whenever he preached, the vast building was filled to the utmost of its capacity. He was generally acknowledged as the most eloquent man who had ever been heard in a French pulpit. In 1838 he again visited Rome; and, after a novitiate, he entered the Dominican order, April 6, 1840. The revival of this order in France then became one of his great objects, but his success was small. As a preacher, however, he continued to command the widest popularity. In 1848 he was elected a member of the National Assembly, and took his seat among the radicals; but having, in a speech, declared himself a Republican, he received a rebuke from his ecclesiastical superior; in consequence of which he retired from politics. The extreme sharpness with which he, in a sermon (1852), expressed himself about the coup d'etat, had the result that he sometime after also retired from the pulpit, and settled at Sorreze as director of the school. His collected works—Conférences, Considerations, Correspondance avec madame Swetchine, Lettres à un jeune homme, etc.—were published in Paris, 1872–73, 9 vols. [His Conferences delivered in the Cathedral of Notre Dame were translated into English by Henry Langdon, New York, 1870: others have also been translated,—Jesus Christ, 1875, God (1870), God and Man (1872). Life (1875).]

LIT. —The best characterizations of Lacordaire (his character and his talent) were given by Sainte-Beuve, in his Causéries de Lundi, and by Charles de Mazade, in Revue Des Deux Mondes, of May 1, 1844. His life has been written by Montalembert, 1863, [by Chocarnk (6th ed., 1880; translated into English by Father Aylward, London and New York, 1876, 2d ed., 1878), by H. L. Sidney Lear (London, 1882), and by Ricard, Paris, 1882.] LACROIX, John Power, . of French parents,
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death. Besides translations and original articles in the months and reviews, he averaged an article weekly for the religious press. In 1843 he became professor of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Ohio Conference. In 1864 he became tutor in the Ohio Wesleyan University; soon after he went abroad, and studied sixteen months in the German universities. From 1864 to 1879 he filled the chair of modern languages in the Ohio Wesleyan University. He translated De Presbyteris Religion and the Reign of Terror, New York, 1868; Naville's Problem 0, 1869; Wuttke's Christian Ethics, 2 vols., 1873. He wrote Life of Rudolf Stier, 1874, Outlines of Christian Ethics, 1879, and numerous articles in McClintock and Strong's Cyclopaedia. He was a modest man, of wide information, sober views, and exulted Christian life.

LACTANTIUS FIRMIANUS (to which names some old manuscripts add those of Lucius Cacilius, or Cacilius) was probably a native of Italy, and, according to Jerome (De vir. ill., 80), a disciple of Arnobius. By Domitian he was called to Nicomedia as teacher of Latin rhetoric; but, as the city was entirely Greek, he found very few pupils, and devoted most of his time to authorship. Having embraced Christianity, he resigned his professorship when the persecution of Diocletian broke out; and he seems to have lived in very humble circumstances until Constantine the Great called him to his court in Gaul as tutor of his son Crispus. The date of his death, like that of his birth, is unknown.

The most important and most celebrated of the Christian works of Lactantius is his Dictonum Institutionum Libri Septem, written during the persecution of Diocletian (between 307 and 310), and afterwards, in a second edition, dedicated to Constantine the Great, between 318 and 333. It is an apology of Christianity, opening with an attack on heathen religion and philosophy, and defending the teachings of the Christian faith against the attacks of the heathen philosophers. He wrote De mortibus persecutorum, etc., Marburg, 1862; Ebert: Uber d. Verfasser d. Buches von der Pers, Dresden, 1870; Kehrein: Quis scripsit libellum de mort. pers., Stuttgart, 1877.

LACTICINIA (literally "milk-dishes") denotes all those kinds of food which are derived from the mammals in a more or less indirect way: such as milk, butter, cheese, etc.; eggs are placed in the same class of food. The Council of Laodicea, 351, and the Trullan Council of 692 ordered complete abstinence from all lacticinia during fasting; and such is still the custom in most Eastern churches. In the Western Church the abstinence from lacticina was generally confined to the quadragesimal fast before Easter, and dispensations were not difficult to procure.

LÆTARE SUNDAY, the fourth Sunday of Lent, thus called from the first word of the introit of the mass, "lætare, "to rejoice," is also called Dominica de rosa, because being the day selected by the Pope for the blessing of the golden rose.

LAFITEAU, Joseph François, a French Jesuit and missionary; b. at Bordeaux, 1670; d. there July 3, 1746. He labored in the Iroquois Indian Mission at Sault St. Louis, Can., from 1712 to 1717. He published Mauvres des sauvages amériquains comparées aux mœurs des premiers temps (Paris, 1723–24, 2 vols.), in which he maintained, from a study of Indian character, that they are descendants of the "barbarians" who inhabited Greece at an early period.

LAIDLIE, Archibald, D.D., b. in Kelso, Scotland, Dec. 4, 1727; d. at Red Hook, N.Y., Nov. 14, 1779. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh; ordained 1759, and settled over the Scotch Church at Flushing, Holland; thence he was called in 1763 to New York City to preach in the English in the College Church, — the first English preacher in the denomination. He was eminently successful as preacher and pastor, although at first called upon to endure great opposition from many of the Dutch denomination.

LAINÉZ, Iago, the second general of the order of the Jesuits; b. at Almancar, Castile, in 1512; d. in Rome, Jan. 19, 1565. He studied at Alcala; joined Ignatius Loyola in Paris; was one of the six who made the vow of a spiritual crusade in the Church of Montmartre, Aug. 13, 1534; and succeeded Loyola as general, June 19, 1557. He completed and consolidated the despotic constitution of the order, awakened and developed its great faculty for education, initiated and trained its wonderful talent for intrigue, and made it that frightful instrument of ambition which it afterwards proved to be. He exercised, also, a direct influence on the history of the Roman Catholic Church by the activities of a developed in the Council of Trent. He actually suppressed every attempt to modify the old doctrine of justification in favor of the ideas of the Reformation; and his violent assertions of the supremacy of the papal power in its relation to the bishops, the Councils, etc., had at all events an effect of embarrassing his opponents. See Lainez, D'Ense: Vie de Lainéz, Douai, 1597; Ribadeneyra: Life
LAMBERT OF HERSFELD

LAI T Y. In the Primitive Christian Church there was theoretical and practical parity of all believers. It was not only taught (1 Pet. ii. 9, 10, v. 3), but acted upon. Laymen had the right to and to prophesy, baptize, and administer the Lord's Supper, and exercise discipline. The distinction between clergy and laity was not sharply drawn. The former were chosen by the people to be their governors and leaders in worship, because they had the requisite gifts: but they formed no priestly caste, nor did they pretend to impose laws upon the churches. As Hatch says, "Church officers were originally regarded as existing for the good government of the community and for the general management of its affairs: the difference between [them] and other baptized persons was one of status and degree. Respecting the spiritual life, the two classes tramped the same footpath; and the functions which the officers performed were such as, apart from the question of order, might be performed by any member of the community." These functions were, however, open only to the male members (1 Cor. xiv. 34 sq.); except prophesying, which was the privilege of either sex (1 Cor. xi. 5). How long this parity of members lasted, it is impossible to say. The growth of the Church pushed the officers into greater prominence, for their offices increased in importance; and gradually those "who did not hold office were excluded from the performance of almost all ecclesiastical functions." The enforced celibacy of the clergy kept them aloof from the common interests of the laity. They were at last considered priests in a peculiar sense. The Lord's Supper became the mass, and the cup was withdrawn from the laity. Portions of the churches, and entire houses, were set apart for clerical use. The breach widened; and so, in spite of an occasional protest, the Christian world was divided into two camps,—one lay, the other clerical. Priestly arrogance and corruption wrought their own curse. The heart of Europe became sick of pretence and tyranny. The Reformation broke out. Then the laity recovered, in a measure, their lost rights. To-day in Protestant churches, specially the non-Episcopal, the laity have every fitting privilege granted them, and theoretically the priesthood of all believers is granted. Nevertheless, lay administration of the sacraments is probably very rarely practised, and would not in many instances be allowed. For further information, see arts. Baptism, Clergy, Dress of the Early Christians, Lay Communion, Lay Preaching, Lay Representation. See also Schaff: History of the Apostolic Church, bk. iii. § 128, pp. 500 sq.; Lightfoot: Commentary on Philippians, excursus, The Christian Ministry, pp. 179 sq.; E. Hatch: The Organization of the Early Church, pp. 111 sq.; E. Mellor: Priesthood in the Light of the New Testament, London, 1876; J. B. Paton: The Origin of the Priesthood in the Christian Church (1878), pp. 55 and P. Madsen: Das geistliche Priesterthum der Christen, Gutersloh, 1882.

LAMAISM is a peculiar development, half religious and half political, of Buddhism. It took place in Tibet, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and presents the most extreme form of a hierarchy, the realization of the very ideal for which the medieval popes fought. From Thibet it spread both into India and China; but Lhassa is still its Rome, and Thibet its patrimonium Petri. In the primitive Buddhism, such as was taught in India by Gautama in the sixth century B.C., the two principles, the ultimate, the inexorable, the successive, but not continuous, revelation of the truth that saves, through a Buddha; and, practically, the embracing of that truth by a converted heart, and a systematical method of ethical and mental self-culture. But in the Buddhism which was introduced in Thibet in the sixth century A.D. both these points had been much corrupted. The idea of a Buddha had entirely changed. Instead of a man, who, by self-denying efforts continued through many hundreds of different births, had acquired the ten cardinal virtues in such perfection that he was able, when sin and ignorance had gained the upper hand in the world, to save the human race from ruin," there presented itself a phantasm, hovering between heaven and earth, and surrounded with a host of fictitious beings. As completely man's relation to the Buddha had changed. A tricky priesthood, playing upon the superstitions of the mass, had taken the place of the heart's conversion and the severe practice of self-training. In the ninth century the old Thibetan worship of evil demons, the Bompa religion, suddenly arose again; and for a time the Buddhist priests were banished from the country. In the fourteenth century a monk, Sonkapa, attempted a reform of Buddhism. Nevertheless, in the fifteenth century, the transformation of Buddhism into Lamaism began.

In its highest form a hierarchy cannot rest satisfied with an infallible pope. In the fifteenth century, Gedun Dub, the head of the Thibetan priesthood, declared himself an incarnation of that Buddha who appeared for the last time in the sixth century B.C., assumed the title of Dalai Lama ("the priest-ocean"), and took up his residence in the celebrated monastery Chabroung, in Lhassa. In the eighteenth century, Tsonkapa, accustomed to the power which was overcome by the aid of the Mongols, the Dalai Lama gradually succeeded, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in usurping the whole civil power; so that at present he is not only the highest, but the only, power in the country. Under him is arranged a graduated series of ecclesiastical officers, ending with the monks, whose number is almost incredible. In Lhassa there are eighteen thousand: in Thibet, in general, every seventh man is a monk. The large bulk of the annual revenue is used to sustain the monasteries, though the monks are the most obstinate beggars in the world, and the priests exceedingly shrewd in extracting money from their flocks. The office of Dalai Lama is not hereditary. When he dies, another incarnate Buddha is established by election; and the Chinese Government is said to exercise not small influence on the election. See Schott: Über d. Buddhismus in Hoch-Asien [n. d.].

LAMB OF GOD. See Agnus Dei.

LAMBERT OF HERSFELD became a monk at Hersfeld, March 15, 1086, and was ordained priest at Aschaffenpurg, Sept. 15 same year. He afterwards made a journey to Jerusalem; and on his
return he visited the monasteries of Siegburg and Saalfeld, to make himself acquainted with the severer rules there introduced. He came, however, to the conclusion that the rules of St. Benedict would suffice, if rigidly held. His literary career had reached a height when he wrote his Commentaries on the Prophets, and several other treatises,—De arbilio hominis vere captivo (against Erasmus), De causis excocationis multis acuorum secutorum, De regno antichristi, De flagella mundi, etc. But in Strassburg he also gradually turned away from the strict Lutheranism, and adopted the views of the Swiss Reformers. In 1526 he was appointed professor of theology in the university of Marburg; and, enjoying the confidence of Landgrave Philipp of Hesse, he took a prominent part in the establishment of the Reformation in that country. He drew up the famous Reformatio ecclesiarum Hassiae, which, though never carried out, forms one of the most interesting documents of its kind from the period of the Reformation (printed in W. C. Schmiemcke: Monumenta. Hassiaca, ii.). See his biographies by J. W. Baum (German, Strassburg, 1840), F. S. Steve (Latin, Breslau, 1867), and Louis Ruffet (French, Paris, 1873).

LAMBERT, Francois, b. at Avignon, 1486; d. at Marburg, April 18, 1580. In his fifteenth year he entered the Franciscan order, and worked, later on, with great success, though without fully satisfying himself, as an itinerant preacher. Luther's writings made a deep impression upon him; and when they were taken from him, anathematized, and burnt, he made up his mind to leave his monastery and his native country. Over Geneva and Zürich he went to Wittenberg, where he arrived in 1523, stayed a whole year, married, lectured on the prophets, and translated several of the Reformers' books into French and Italian. In 1524 he went to Strassburg, where he published his Commentaries on the Prophets, and several treatises,—De arbitrio hominis vere captivo (against Erasmus), De causis excocationis multis acuorum secutorum, De regno antichristi, De flagella mundi, etc. But in Strassburg he also gradually turned away from the strict Lutheranism, and adopted the views of the Swiss Reformers. In 1526 he was appointed professor of theology in the university of Marburg; and, enjoying the confidence of Landgrave Philipp of Hesse, he took a prominent part in the establishment of the Reformation in that country. He drew up the famous Reformatio ecclesiarum Hassiae, which, though never carried out, forms one of the most interesting documents of its kind from the period of the Reformation (printed in W. C. Schmiemcke: Monumenta. Hassiaca, ii.). See his biographies by J. W. Baum (German, Strassburg, 1840), F. S. Steve (Latin, Breslau, 1867), and Louis Ruffet (French, Paris, 1873). WAGENMANN.

LAMBERT ARTICLES. See ARTICLES, LAMBERT.

LAMBRUSCHINI, Luigi, b. at Genoa, May 6, 1778; d. in Rome, May 8, 1854. He entered the order of the Barnabites; was made Archbishop of Genoa in 1819; and was in 1823 sent as papal nuncio to Paris, where, by the advice he gave Charles X., he is said to have contributed not a little to the fall of the Bourbons. Made cardinal in 1831, and secretary of state in 1836, he was the true father of that policy which characterized the reign of Gregory XVI., and which finally conjured up the revolution in the very dominions of the Pope. With the death of Gregory XVI. his public career was ended; but he was so hated, that, when the Revolution broke out in 1848, he was compelled to flee, disguised as a groom. His Opere spirituali were published in Rome, 1836. His celebrated memoir in the Droste-Vischer affair was translated into German, Ratisbon, 1838. KÜPFEL.

LAMECH. See CAIN.

LAMENNAIS, Hugues Félicité Robert de, b. at St. Malo, July 19, 1782; d. in Paris, Feb. 27, 1854. He entered the seminary of St. Malo in 1811, was ordained a priest in 1816, and published in 1817 the first volume of his Essai sur l'Indifférence en matière de Religion, of which the fourth and last volume appeared in 1824. The book made a great sensation. It at once rallied and consolidated the Ultramontanist party, and in the Church in general it produced a kind of revival. The bishops, the Sorbonne, and the Jesuits were strongly opposed to it; but Leo XII. offered the author a cardinal's hat, which, however, he declined. With Gallicanism he broke still more decidedly in his De la religion considérée dans ses rapports avec l'ordre politique et civil (1826); and soon after he abandoned the Bourbons, whose fall he predicted in his Des progres de la révolution (1829). In order to make the Church perfectly free, he demanded that it should be separated from the State, and rebuilt on completely democratic principles; but these ideas, which he propagated in his paper, L'Avenir,— founded in 1830, when the revolution had established the liberty of the press,— did not find favor with the Pope. By an encyclical of Aug. 15, 1832, Gregory XVI. condemned them, L'Avenir ceased to come out, and Lamennais retired from public life. He did not submit, however. By his Paroles d'un Croyant (1836) he definitely broke with Rome, and pursued his course independently, showing more and more of the social radicalism which he combined with his religious radicalism: Livre du peuple (1837), L'Esclavage moderne, Le pays et le gouvernement, etc. His last great works were his Essais d'une philosophie (1841—46), and a translation, with notes, of the Gospels (1840). In 1848 he was elected a member of the National Assembly, but was unable to carry through any of his plans, and, after the coup d'État of 1852, he retired altogether from public life, deeply disappointed. See LACORDAIRE: Considérations sur le système philosoph. de M. de L., Paris, 1834; A. BLAIZE: Essai biog. sur Lamennais, Paris, 1839; EMILE FORGUES: Correspondance, Paris, 1858, 2 vols. C. PFENDER.

LAMENTS. See CAIN.

LAMENTS is the name of five elegies, in which is bewailed the mournful lot that came upon Jerusalem in the Chaldean invasion of 588 B.C. The name in the Hebrew text is Echah (מיה, "How"),—the word with which the first, second, and fourth chapters open; but the Jews, according to Jerome, also used the designation "Lamentations" (Kineka, נומ), which was likewise employed in the LXX. (Ελοποια) and the Vulgate (Threni). It was counted in the LXX. as one book with Jeremiah's Prophecy, just as Ruth was...
to be taken into account. No striking difference in the Prophecy and Lamentations has been denied in whole (Ewald, Noldeke, Schrader, recent times that the Jeremianic authorship has contents of the compositions is in this connection part (Thenius, etc.. The lexicographical divider Jeremiah was to write the Lamentations (comp. Nagelsbach, etc.) or in Jeremiah at Josiah's death (2 Chron. xxxv. 22). But this passage shows how well fitted Jerusalem was carried into captivity, and Jerusalem was laid waste, Jeremiah sat weeping, and made this lamentation over Jerusalem, and said. Jerome wrongly identifies our book with the elegies sung by Jeremiah at Josiah's death (2 Chron. xxxv. 25). But this passage shows how well fitted Jeremiah was to write the Lamentations (comp. Jer. viii. 18-22, xiv. 17 sq.). They also have much in common with the Prophecy, both in language, and line of thought. It is only in quite recent times that the Jeremianic authorship has been denied in whole (Ewald, Nobleke, Schrader, Nægelsbach [Professor W. R. Smith, etc.] or in part (Thenius, etc.). The lexicographical differences in the Prophecy and Lamentations have been urged (Nægelsbach), but the difference of contents of the compositions is in this connection to be taken into account. No striking difference in the spiritual tone can be made out. In general, we must remember that Jeremiah here appears exclusively as the patriot, and not at all as the divinely-sent advocate, as in the Prophecy. Chap. iii. strongly favors the current and traditional view. We cannot get rid of the impression that it is Jeremiah who is relating his own personal experiences. In later times the Lamentations were sung by the Jews on the 9th of Ab, the anniversary of the burning of the temple; and in the Catholic Church they are incorporated in the liturgical service of Passion Week.

Lit.—Parkau: Threni Jer. philol. et crit. illustr., Lugd. Bat., 1780; also the Commentaries of Theissen (Leipzig, 1855), [Henderson (Lond., 1851, Andover, 1866)], Englerhard (Leipzig, 1867), Nægelsbach (Bielefeld, 1868), [Eng. trans. in Lange, New York, 1871], Keil, Leipzig, 1872 [Eng. trans., 1874], Dean R. Payne Smith, in Speaker's Commentary (New York, 1875), Schnelle, (Prague, 1870). See also Ewald: Dictier d. A. B.; R. Hitt, in Introductions to the Old Testament of De Wette, Bleek, [and Reuss; the excellent article of Dr. Plumptre, in Smith's Bible Dictionary; and Professor W. R. Smith, in Encyclopedia Britannica. See also Dr. Wünsche's translation of Echa Rabba, the Midrash upon Lamentations, Leipzig, 1882. For full list of Literature, see Lange's Commentary].

Von Orelli.

LAMI, Bernard, b. at Mans, June, 1640; d. at Rouen, Jan. 29, 1718. In 1658 he entered the Congregation of the Oratory, and taught philosophy and mathematics at various places; but his enthusiasm for the Cartesian philosophy made him many enemies among the Aristotelians, and in 1678 he was banished to Grenoble. Recalled to Paris in 1686, he was banished once more, and finally settled at Rouen. His Apparatus Biblicalus (Lyon, 1698) was twice translated into French under the title, Introduction à l'Ecriture sainte, by Bellegarde and by Boyer, and also into English by R. Bundy (London, 1729). Among his other works are Harmonia sive Concordia quaterni Evangelistarum (1689) and De Tabernaculo fideris, etc. (1720), on which he is said to have worked for thirty years.

LAMMAS-DAY, or LAMMAS-TIDE, Aug. 1, celebrated by the Roman Catholics in memory of St. Peter's imprisonment, is probably an old Pagan festival dating back to the days of Druidism. The derivation of the name (whether from lamb-mass or from loaf-mass) is uncertain, though the latter seems preferable, as it was an old Saxon custom to make sacrifices of grain on the 1st of August.

LAMPE, Friedrich Adolf, one of the most distinguished Calvinistic divines of the eighteenth century; b. Feb. 18, 1683, at Detmold; d. at Bremen, Dec. 6, 1726. He was educated in the academy of Bremen, 1698-1702; studied theology at Franeker; was professor of dogmatics at the university of Utrecht, 1720-27, and finally pastor of St. Ansgr, and professor at the academy of Bremen. The revival of the federal theology, and the advancement of Bible study in the Reformed Church, are his great merits. His principal works are, Geheimniss des Gnadenbundes (6 vols.); Milch der Warheit, an exposition of the Heidelberg Catechism; Theologia actio seu practica, a very full commentary on the Gospel of John (5 vols.); and a number of excellent hymns, etc. See O. Thelemann: Friedrich Adolf Lampe, 1868.

O. THELEMAN.

LAMPETIANS. See MESSALIANS.

LANCE, The Holy, was, according to the report of Bishop Luitprand of Cremona, presented by King Rudolph of Burgundy to King Henry I. of Germany. According to the original tradition, it was made from the nails with which Jesus was fastened to the cross; but a later tradition identified it with the spear with which the Roman soldier pierced the side of Jesus. Under Charles IV. it was brought to Prague, and in 1354 Innocent VI. established a festival (de lanceo) in its honor. Another holy lance was discovered by the Eu-
press Helena, and preserved in the portico of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. It was afterwards brought to Antioch, where it was discovered, in 1093, by the French monk Peter Bartholomew, who exhibited it to the crusaders, and thereby fired their spirit for their great enterprise against the Saracens. Afterwards it travelled from Antioch to Constantinople, from Constantinople to Venice, from Venice to France, and thence back to Constantinople. The iron with which it was inlaid was brought to Rome under Innocent VIII., and is preserved in the basilica of the Vatican. Neither of these lances, however, has been for some time recognized as genuine by the Church of Rome.

[LANCELOT, Joannes Paulus, was professor of canon law at Perugia, where he died (1590), and is noted as author of the Institutiones juris canonici, which are often printed as an appendix to the Corpus juris canonici. In 1557 Paul IV. charged him with writing a text-book of canon law after the model of Justinian's Institutiones, and two years afterwards he handed in the finished work to the papal censor. The committee appointed to examine it recommended it very highly; but, on account of certain passages which the author was unwilling to change, it did not obtain the approbation of the Pope. It was published at Perugia (1563), with a dedication to Pius IV.; and, as it found a very extended use as a text-book, Paul V. allowed it to be printed as an appendix to the Corpus juris canonici, though without formally authorizing its use. Later editors have carefully noted the differences which canonical legislation after the Council of Trent has introduced. A French translation by Durand de Maillane (Lyons, 1710) notes the difference of Italian and Gallican practice. See Von Schultze: Geschichtliche der Quel. u. Litz. d. rothen, P.F. 451 sqq. H. F. Jacobson.

LANDERER, Maximilian Albert von, one of the most learned and able, though not one of the best known, representatives of the school of theology occupying an intermediate position between the old supranaturalism and modern rationalism (Vermittlungsphilologie); b. Jan. 14, 1810, in Maulbronn, Württemberg; d. April 13, 1878, in Tübingen. He was a man who shunned the public gaze; and his literary activity was carried on in quiet, unostentatious retirement. After studying at Tübingen, where Dorner was his fellow-student, he became his father's assistant in the pastorate of Waldorf, then tutor at Maulbronn, and repetent at Tübingen. In 1839 he became pastor in Göppingen; but a growing deafness and a poor address made him ill fitted for the pastoral office, and in 1841 he returned to Tübingen as professor. Here he continued during the remainder of his life, and in 1877 resigned his professorship. At Tübingen he occupied an intermediate position between Baur and J. T. Beck. Rejecting the Hegelian principle of absolute knowledge, he emphasized the religious experience in the department of systematic theology. He did not, however, forcibly separate it from the revelation of the Scriptures. The central doctrine in systematic theology he regarded as the joint dominion of God and man in Jesus of Nazareth; and he laid special emphasis on the humanity of Christ, insisting, however, upon his supernatural birth and absolute sinlessness.

He was a faithful lecturer, but had a decided Suabian accent, which sometimes made it hard for students from other parts of Germany to understand him. He was not as imposing in presence as Baur or Beck, and yet, as we have said, he was one of the most influential of the theologians of his school; and the student learned to respect him more highly, the more intimately he came in contact with him. Yet we look almost in vain for any fruits of his literary activity in published works. In fact, these were confined, during his lifetime, to thirteen articles in the first edition of Herzog, and an article on the relation of grace to the freedom of the will in the application of salvation, in the Jahrbiicher f. d. Theol. The articles in Herzog, especially that on Melanchthon, were excellent. The small number of his publications was the result of a conscientious disinclination to neglect the utmost elaboration of his lectures, and a want of self-confidence. He shrank from appearing before the public with his lectures on theology; and he was, in fact, unusually sensitive to all criticism. But he combined all the best qualities of the Suabian character, was strictly honest, and despised sham.

Since his death there have been edited from his manuscripts Zur Dogmatik. Zwei akad. Reden (by Buder and Weise), with his Gedächtnissrede auf F. C. Baur, Tübingen, 1879; a volume of Sermons (by Lang), Heilbronn, 1880; and Neueste Dogmengesch. (by Paul Zeller), Heilbronn, 1881, which takes up the period from Semler to the present time. See Worte d. Erinnerung an Dr. M. A. Landorger, Tübingen, 1878. B. Schmidt.

LANE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, Cincinnati, O., was founded in 1829. Its original endowment consisted of four thousand dollars donated by Ebenezer Lane and brother, and of sixty acres of land on Walnut Hills, given by members of the Kemper family. It was at first proposed to establish an academic and collegiate as well as theological institution; and a preparatory school was first opened Nov. 18, 1829. After an experiment of five years, the academic and collegiate departments were finally closed. The theological department went into operation in December, 1832, when Drs. Lyman Beecher and T. J. Biggs were formally inducted into office. Professor Calvin E. Stowe, D.D., entered upon his duties in the following July, and Baxter Dickinson, D.D., in October, 1835.

Among those who have served the seminary since its organization, next to Dr. Beecher, the name of D. Howe Allen, D.D., is especially conspicuous. He was professor of sacred rhetoric from 1840 to 1861, and from that date till 1867...
(when he resigned) the professor in systematic theology. Like Dr. Beecher, he continued to be professor emeritus till his death, which occurred in 1870. George E. Day, D.D., was professor of biblical literature from 1851 to 1866. Robert Nelson, D.D., was professor of theology from 1867 to 1874; and Thomas E. Thomas, D.D., professor of New Testament literature from 1871 to his death, in 1875. Jonathan B. Condit, D.D., and Elisha Ballantine, D.D., served the seminary for shorter periods. Henry Smith, D.D., LL.D., was professor of sacred rhetoric from 1855 to 1861. In 1865 he returned to the same department, and remained in the discharge of its duties, with the addition of pastoral theology, till his decease, in 1879. Zephaniah M. Humphrey, D.D., was professor of church history from 1873 till his death, in 1875.

The faculty at present (1882) consists of five professors: occasional lectures and instructions are given by others. The average number of students in attendance is about forty, but increasing annually. The institution has a fair endowment, some scholarship and library funds, and a theological library of thirteen thousand volumes. Its buildings are new and commodious.

The whole number of graduates is about seven hundred, of whom probably five hundred and fifty are still living. The large majority of these brethren have been, or still are, engaged in the missionary work of the Presbyterian Church, in the region between the Alleghanies and the oulying territories of the West, whilst nearly forty have gone into the foreign field. Many of them have signalized themselves as capable and effective preachers, and as earnest and practical laborers in every department of ministerial service.

The actual work done by them, their unquestioned orthodoxy, and their unsullied Christian character, have been the best possible witness to the faithfulness, the completeness, and the practical nature, of the training they have received at the seminary.

LANFRANC, thirty-fourth Archbishop of Canterbury, one of the most prominent instruments in the revival of church and theology in France and England in the eleventh century; the defender of the doctrine of transubstantiation against Berengar of Tours; and the assistant of William the Conqueror in the conquest of England. It was because he was indispensable to the organization of the English Church, and had an understanding with William (Freeman, vol. iv. p. 95), that he refused the archbishopric of Rouen in 1067, and three years later accepted the archbishopric of Canterbury. With this view his reluctance to assume the latter office is quite compatible; the rudeness of the clergy, and especially the revolt of the Anglo-Saxons against the dominion of foreigners in the Church, offering not incon siderable difficulties. He contributed much to the establishment of the Norman dominion by the metropolitan of York being made, by the synods of Winchester and Windsor (1072), subject to Canterbury. With diplomatic skill he gradually displaced the native prelates and abbots; so that at last Wulfstan was the only Anglo-Saxon occupying a bishopric. Otherwise he was an enlightened prelate, insisting upon the reformation of conventual life, and the pursuit of literature.

In his relation to Rome, Lanfranc advocated the reforms of Hildebrand, to whom he offered, upon the whole, loyal obedience; but he insisted upon the king's independence, even in ecclesiastical affairs. The decree of Lanfranc was enforced by him (at the synod of Winchester, 1078) for the higher clergy; the parochial clergy being allowed to retain their wives, but all clergymen being forbidden to marry in the future. In some instances he espoused the side of his sovereign against the Pope, and was refused a passport to Rome when (1081) the Pope demanded his presence, with the threat of suspension if he did not comply. He outlived the Conqueror (d. 1087), and reluctantly acquiesced in his request to crown William Rufus king.

Lanfranc was more prominent as an ecclesiastical administrator than as a writer. But the succeeding generations were loud in their praises of his literary achievements; and we cannot doubt,
that, so long as he remained in Normandy, he took a prominent place as a teacher and author. Milo Crispinus says that Athens appeared again at Bec under his influence: and William of Malmesbury describes the convent there as a great and famous literary gymnasion, and calls him the most learned man of his time (De Gest. regq. Angl., i., iii.). It is not necessary to give other testimonies of a like intent. To him we must, at any rate, accord the most place among those who contributed to the revival of learning in the eleventh century. He was a skilled dialectician, and proposed an emendation of the Vulgate, which probably was meant to extend only to the correction of the copies. But there are no evidences of speculative ability in his writings.

The most important of Lanfranc's works is the Liber de corpore et sanguine Domini ("The Body and Blood of Christ"), which is composed of twenty-three chapters, written in an epistolary form. It teaches the doctrine of transubstantiation, and was meant to be a defence of it against the correction of the copies. But there are no evidences of speculative ability in his writings.

In 1871. He edited the Zeitschriften (1859—72), a popular representation of the dogmatics of the school of Tubingen, 1857; Stunden der Andacht, 1862—65, 2 vols.; Ein Gang durch die christliche Welt, Religiöse Charaktere, Das Leben des Apostels Paulus, etc. See E. Stroehlin: A. Conquerel et H. Lang, Geneva, 1876; Biedermann: Henri Lang, Zürich, 1876; Mayer: H. Lang, Basel, 1877.

LANG, John Dunmore, D.D. This extraordinary man, whose influence on the political and moral, as well as on the ecclesiastical, history of Australia, has been very great, was born at Greenock, Scotland, in 1709, and died at Sydney, New South Wales, in 1785. Educated at the parish school of Largs and the University of Edinburgh, he was ordained by the presbytery of Irvine, and proceeded in 1825, as the first minister of the Church of Scotland, to Australia. At a time when every increase to the population was of the utmost consequence, he was the means of bringing out many thousands of excellent emigrants from Great Britain to the new colonies, as also ministers and teachers for the work of the Church. He represented Port Phillip, Moreton Bay, and Sydney successively in the Legislative Assembly, and was chiefly instrumental in securing the separation and independence of Victoria and Queensland from New South Wales. He also carried other useful measures in Parliament, including the repeal of the act imposing a poll-tax on Chineaman. Besides a lengthened connection with the newspaper press, in which he strove to advance the moral and political welfare of his countrymen, he published several works, the chief of which is the History of New South Wales. He took an active interest in the union of the Presbyterian churches, and in establishing the Presbyterian college. The large place he filled in Church and State was evinced by the presence of seventy thousand people at his funeral, including the most distinguished men in the community of different denominations.

R. S. Duff

LANG, Joachim, b. at Gardelegen in Altmark, Oct. 26, 1670; d. at Halle, May 7, 1744. He was educated at Quedlinburg and Magdeburg, and studied theology at Leipzig, where he was intimately acquainted with A. H. Francke, whom he followed to Erfurt (1690) and Halle (1691). In 1693 he settled in Berlin, first as private tutor, afterwards as rector of the Friedriechsidersches college. In Berlin he conversed much with Spener, and, when, in 1700, he was appointed professor of theology at Halle, he became the literary representative of the Pietists. He was an exceedingly prolific writer. In his controversy with the orthodox, represented by Lösch, he wrote Idee theologica pseudorthodoxae (1706), Auf richtige Nachricht (1707—14, 5 vols.), Antitheses orthodoxae (1709—11), Richtige Mittlestrasse (1712—14, 4 vols., etc.). In his controversy with C. Wolff, the philosopher, he wrote Causa Dei (1723), Modesta disquisitionis, Nova anatome (1726), etc. Though he succeeded in having Wolff expelled from Halle, he could not prevent him from returning triumphantly, while he himself was ordered to stop writing against him. He also published a number of historical, dogmatical, and exegetical works, and an autobiography (incomplete), Leipzig, 1744.

WAGENMANN.
LANIGAN, John, Irish Roman-Catholic priest; b. in Cashel, 1758; d. at Finglas, near Dublin, July 7, 1828. He was educated at the Irish college at Rome, where he took a doctor's degree. Subsequently he was professor of "Hebrew, divinity, and the Scriptures" in Pavia, but in 1786 appointed to a position in the record tower, Dublin, to the original duties of which, in 1796, were added those of librarian, editor, and translator for the Dublin Society. In 1821 he had to be removed to a private insane-asylum at Finglas. He was the author of the valuable works, Institutionum bivalentarum (Pavia, 1794), Protestant's Apology for the Roman-Catholic Church (Dublin, 1809), Ecclesiastical History of Ireland to the Thirteenth Century (Dublin, 1822, 4 vols.; 2d ed., 1829). He also published an Irish translation of the Roman Breviary.

LANGRES, Synod of (Concilium Lingonense). Early in June, 830, a council was held at Langres, a city of Burgundy. Sixteen canones (referring to dogmatics, church polity, and discipline) were agreed upon. Annual provincial and biennial general synods were established. The right of the people, still existing in some places, to elect their bishop, was severely attacked; and so was the exemption of certain monasteries from the episcopal authority. In dogmatical respect the synod of Langres was merely a preparation for the synod of Toul, for the campaign against the semi-Pelagian views represented by Hincmar, as was soon shown. See Mansi, xvi. 597; Harduin, v. 481.

LANGTON, Stephen, Archbishop of Canterbury, and a distinguished statesman; d. at Siondon, July 9, 1228. The date of his birth is unknown; and there is much uncertainty about the locality, Lincolnshire having most claim to the honor. There is no doubt, that, unlike many of his predecessors, he was born in England. He was educated at the university of Paris, and seems to have held a position of influence in connection with it. He there contracted a friendship with Locris, afterwards Innocent III. In 1206 he went to Rome, and was made cardinal-priest of St. Chrysogonus. At the death of Hubert, archbishop of Canterbury, Reginald appeared before the Pope with some monks, claiming to have been elected by the chapter to the vacant see, and desiring the Pope to confer the pallium on the bishop of Norwich. Innocent, ignoring both these nominees, on the ground of alleged irregularities in their election, ordered the priests from England to proceed to an election in his presence, and, at his suggestion, chose Langton. He was consecrated by the Pope's own hand, at Viterbo, June 17, 1207, and in spite of the king's protests. A better choice could not have been made; for Stephen was not only a man of learning and piety, but advanced, at a later period, to the front rank of English patriots. For six years he was obliged to wait at Pontigny, in France, before coming into the possession of his see. In the mean time his election became the occasion of one of the most spirited contests in the history of the relations of the papal see with England. John refused to allow it to be read in the churches, he was suspended from his archiepiscopal office by the papal commissioners. He went to Rome, but the Pope confirmed the sentence. He did not return to England till 1218, remaining a state prisoner in Rome for at least a part of the interval. He crowned Henry III. in 1220, and maintained a firm attitude during his reign. A stone coffin is still exhibited in Canterbury Cathedral, which is said to contain his remains.

There are few materials for the history of Stephen Langton's life, but the little that we do know shows him to have been a man of statesmanlike energy and abilities. He left a number of writings; e.g., a Commentary on most of the books of the Old Testament, a Hexameron on the six days of the creation, and is said to have written a Life of Richard I., etc. Stephen's brother, Simon Langton, was also a man of much influence in his day, and was chosen archbishop of York, but not permitted by John to occupy the see. The principal authority for the events of Stephen's life is the Chronicle of Roger of Wendenover. See Hook, Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbur, ii. 657—761, the various histories of England and the Church of England, and art. Innocent III.

LANQUET, Hubert, b. at Viterbo, near Autun, in 1518; d. in Antwerp, Sept. 30, 1581. He studied theology, canon law, history, and natural science, in Poiitiers, Padua, and Bologna; visited also Spain, and was, by the reading of Melanchthon's Loci Theologici, induced to go to Wittenberg, where he lived in Melanchthon's house from 1549 to 1560, making frequent journeys in Germany and Scandinavia. At what period he definitely embraced the Reformation is not known. In 1560 he entered the service of the elector of Saxony, and acted as his diplomatic agent till 1577, in Paris, Vienna, and other places. The last years of his life he spent in the Netherlands, in intimate connection with William the Silent. His letters, which are of the greatest interest for the history of his time, have been published in several collections; but the work which gives him a place in ecclesiastical history is his Vindicia contra tyrannos, published pseudonymously in 1578, and treating the question whether subjects (for instance, Protestants) have a right to revolt, when suppressed for their reli
gion's sake by their princes. The book made a great sensation, and was translated into all European languages by Philostratus, Ugo MARE (Halle 1799) and H. Chevrel (Paris, 1856), and Treitzschke, prefixed to the latter's edition of the Vindiciae, Leipzig, 1846.

Theodors Schott.

Laodicia was the name of several cities in Syria and Asia Minor, of which one—generally called Laodicia ad Lycaum—was near the boundary-line between Phrygia and Lydia, on the Lycaus—is mentioned in the New Testament. During the latter part of the republic of Rome and the first period of the empire, the city was the capital of Greater Phrygia, and a flourishing commercial place; and an important Christian congregation was early formed there. Having suffered much at various times from earthquakes (e.g., A.D. 64), it was finally destroyed by the Turks, and is now only a heap of ruins. A council was held there between 343 and 361; and the sixty canones agreed upon there are still extant. They are exclusively of disciplinary interest. In the enumeration of the books contained in the Bible, the Apocrypha of the Old Testament and the Book of Revelation of the New Testament are left out. See Harduin, i.; Mansi, ii.; Hefele, i. pp. 721-753; and Lightfoot, On Colossians, pp. 1-72.

Laodicia, the Epistle from. The allusion of Paul to an epistle from Laodicia (Col. iv. 16) has given rise to much speculation. Bishop Lightfoot, in his Commentary on the Colossians (pp. 340-360), presents an exhaustive excursus upon the subject. He thus tabulates the various theories. The epistle in question was (1) An epistle written by the Laodicians to (a) Paul, (b) Epaphras, (c) Colossus; (2) An epistle written by Paul from Laodicia, identical with (a) 1 Timothy, (b) 1 Thessalonians, (c) 2 Thessalonians, (d) Galatians; (3) An epistle addressed to the Laodicians by (a) John, (b) John, (c) some companion of Paul, (d) Epaphras or Luke, (e) Paul himself, (f) a lost epistle; (ii) one of the canonical epistles, (a) Hebrews, (b) Philémon, (c) Ephesians; (iii) the apocryphal epistle. Lightfoot discusses briefly but sufficiently these theories, and decides for the identification of the epistle with the canonical Ephesians. This is doubtless the true solution of the problem. The other views are either contradicted by the Greek, or acted upon by a desire to withdraw from the apocryphal epistle, or else mere speculation. But, for the identification with the Epistle to the Ephesians, there are the tenable arguments that the words ἐν Εφέσῳ (“in Ephesus”) and ἐν Ταύτῃ (“in the same”) (Eph. i. 1) are wanting in some of the best manuscripts, and are bracketed by Westcott and Hort; but, if they were omitted by the apostle, then he meant to make the epistle an encyclical; in which case it might be sent to Laodicia, and by the Laodicians forwarded to Colossæ. Again this explains the absence of personal allusions in Ephesians, and obviates the supposition that an epistle, to which particular attention was called, has been lost.

As for the apocryphal Epistle to the Laodicæans, it is “a cento of Pauline phrases strung together without being aware of the flavor, in clear object... taken chiefly from the Epistle to the Ephesians. It is quite harmless, so far as falsity and stupidity combined can ever be regarded as harmless.” It was probably originally written, or rather compiled, in Greek, and translated into Latin at a very early period, and widely known prior to the close of the fourteenth century, condemned emphatically by Jerome, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret, yet read in the eighth century; for the second Council of Nicaea (787) warned against it. It was in the Latin translation that it attained circulation and, in the Latin Church, Gregory alluded to it as genuine,—not by name, however, and—subsequent writers followed it. It is found in Pauline manuscripts from the sixth to the fifteenth centuries, in one of the two most ancient copies of the Vulgate, and frequently in the versions, even in English, in the fifteenth century, though Wieland and Purvey excluded it. At length the revival of learning dealt its death-blow to this, as to so many other spurious pretensions. See Anger: Ueber den Laodiceenerbrief, Leipzig, 1843; and Lightfoot: St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians and to Philemon, London, 1873.

Laos, an Asiatic people inhabiting the eastern portion of Siam. They have all the characteristics of the Siames, by whom their country, which up to that time had been independent, was subjugated in 1828. They number about one million five hundred thousand. The Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church (United States) established a mission among the Laos in 1867. The chief station is Chieng-Mai, five hundred miles north of Bangkok. There were in 1882 two clerical, one medical, and one female missionary connected with the mission, with a hundred and twenty-seven native communicants, fifty of whom were added in 1881.

Laotze, the reputed founder of the Chinese religion called “Taoism.” He was born about 604 B.C., near the present Kwei-te, in Ho-nan province, China; d. at an unknown place and time, probably at a great age. In 477 B.C. he met Kung-fu-tse (Confucius), and the brief account of their interview is the only fact of interest concerning him. He was keeper of the archives at the court of Chän, and it was to learn something about the ancient rites and ceremonies of Chän that Confucius came to him. Foreseeing the downfall of Chän, Lao retired to a far country, stopping, however, long enough with Yin Hse to write for him the remarkable volume, in five thousand characters, on the subject of Täo (the Way) and Tēh (Virtue), called Täo Teh King. Lao was a philosopher, as his name (“the Old Philosopher”) implies. His great work, Täo Teh King, is translated in Legge's Chinese Classics, and in Chalmers' The Speculations of the “Old Philosopher” Law-tsze. It is, however, not throughout intelligible even to native Chinese scholars, much less to other readers. It may be briefly described as an ethical treatise, in which the duties of the individual and the State are set forth. Lao lays great stress upon humility and upon gentleness, and, in one sentence at least, approaches Christian ethics. “It is the way of Täo not to act from any personal motive, to conduct affairs without feeling the trouble of them, to taste without being aware of the flavor, in clear object... taken chiefly from the Epistle to the Ephesians.” Lao was
a theist, although he is not explicit on this point.

“There is hardly a word in his treatise which savors either of superstition or religion.” It is now agreed that the word “Jehovah” does not occur in it, as was fancied; and so the supposition that Lao was inspired, or else had contact with the true religion in some shape, is baseless.

Taoism is today one of the Chinese religions, ranking with Confucianism and Buddhism; but it is only in small measure based upon Lao’s teachings, and is so vastly inferior in its conceptions, that Dr. Legge says “he ought not to bear the obloquy” of being its founder. Taoism did not come up until five hundred years after Lao’s death. At first it was little more than a belief in magic. In the first century before Christ, the head of the sect was a wonderful magician; and the present acknowledged “pope” of Taoism is one of this magician’s descendants. In the first Christian century, Taoism took on more of the outward semblance of a religion, borrowing from Buddhism, and so the supposition that Dr. Legge says “he ought not to bear the obloquy” of being its founder, that Lao was inspired, or else had contact with the Jews, is baseless. Now agreed that the word “Jehovah” does not occur in it, as was fancied; and so the supposition that Lao was inspired, or else had contact with the true religion in some shape, is baseless.
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only was a distinction made between sacrificati and libellatici, etc., but regard was paid to the individual circumstances of each case, thus gradually transforming the penitential into a system of casuistry. The oldest and most important of such penitential decisions are the Liber de penitentia by Petrus Alexandrinus, the canones, 1–4 of the synod of Elvira (306), 1–9 of the synod of Ancyra (314), and 10–14 of the synod of Nicæa (325). See Morinus: De disciplina, 1651; Steitz: Das römische Bußsacrament, 1854; Frank: Die Bußsädiplom der Kirche bis zum 7. Jahrhundert, 1868.

ADORF HARNACK.

LARDNER, Nathaniel, b. at Hawkhurst, Kent, June 6, 1684; d. there July 24, 1768. He was educated at an academy in Hoxton Square, and at Utrecht, where, in 1699, he continued his studies. He then removed to Leyden for six months, and returned to London in 1703. He devoted himself for six years longer to those studies which made him so eminently learned. He was for a time chaplain to Lady Treby; and under her roof, after travelling in the Netherlands, he resided until the time of her death. Here he had ample opportunities for pursuing those researches which qualified him for the work he afterwards accomplished. No orator (indeed, very defective in elocution), he was unfitted to make an impression in the pulpit; and consequently the only charge he had in early life was an assistantship to his father, Mr. Richard Lardner. What still further incapacitated him for ministerial work was his extreme deafness; for he said, "When I sit in the pulpit, and the congregation is singing, I can hardly tell whether they are singing or not." His learning, however, eminently qualified him for lecturing; and in this important employment we find him engaged in 1723, when a course of lectures was "set on foot, on a Tuesday evening, for the purpose of sitting and defending the evidences of natural and revealed religion." These lectures no doubt contained the germs of his great work on The Credibility of the Gospel History, which he published by degrees in two unequal parts, in 1724 and 1725. The first part is composed of five volumes, and the second of three volumes. The first, in 1724; the second, in 1725; the third, in 1726; the fourth, in 1727; and the fifth, in 1728. The first volume consisted of 12 books. The second of 7 books. The third of 5 books. The fourth of 4 books. The fifth of 1 book. The sixth, in 1729; the seventh, in 1730; the eighth, in 1731; the ninth, in 1732; the tenth, in 1733; the eleventh, in 1734; and the twelfth, in 1735. The dates are interesting. Oaks do not grow like larches; and such a work as Lardner's was the work of a lifetime. There can be no doubt that the treasures of learning in reference to Christianity contained in these volumes have supplied capital not only for Paley, but a good many more. Indeed, Gibbon owed much to this author. Lardner published many other books besides his magnus opus, and particularly unfolded his views of the person of Christ in his True Doctrine of the New Testament on that subject, in which he says that the Logos who is said to "manfully dwelt in the humanity of Jesus; that he was miraculously conceived, and possessed "divine qualities or perfections." We have not space to enumerate all which Lardner published; but it will be found in the handsome edition of his works in ten volumes, edited by Kippis in 1829. The history of his books is the history of his life; but it should be added that they attracted toward him learned men of all sorts, who, provided with pen and ink and paper, laboriously communicated with the poor deaf scholar. As to ecclesiastical government, he ranks with English Presbyterians. A life of him is prefixed to his works.

JOHN STOUGHTON.

LA SALLE, Jean Baptiste de, founder of the Ignorantines (see art.); b. at Rheims, 1651; d. at Rouen, 1719. He entered holy orders, took the degree of doctor of theology from the university of Paris, and became a canon at Rheims. In 1891 he began his free schools for youth; and so great was the success of his rules, that he founded a teaching order of religions. Benedict XIII. approved his design; and the order adopted the name Frères des Écoles chrétiennes, otherwise known as Ignorantines. La Salle was canonized in 1852 by Pius IX. See his Life by Abbé Ayma, Aix, 1858.

LA SAUSSAYE, Daniel Chantepie de, Dutch theologian, b. at The Hague, Dec. 10, 1816; d. in Groningen, Feb. 13, 1874. He was educated at the university of Leyden. He was pastor at Leeuwardes (1842–48), at Leyden (1848–52), at Rotterdam (1862–72), and in the latter year was appointed professor of biblical and dogmatical theology at Groningen. He received the degree of D.D. from Bonn, in 1858. His fame rests upon his distinguished services in combating the negative and rationalistic views of the Leyden school, especially its founder, J. H. Scholten. He was a fervent orator, impressed with the supernatural origin of Christianity, and eager in its defence. His works are not, however, of permanent value. See list in Lichtenberger's Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses, vol. xii. p. 692.

LASCO, Johannes a, or Jan Laski, b. in Warsaw, 1499; d. on his estate, near Kricic, Jan. 13, 1560. Descending from one of the oldest, richest, and most distinguished families of the Polish nobility, but a younger son, he was educated for the Church, and went, when twenty-five years old, abroad, to finish his education. He visited Louvain, Zürich (where he made the acquaintance of Zwingle), and Basel, where he lived in the house of Erasmus. Returning home in 1528, he was rapidly promoted; but when the king, in 1536, offered him the episcopate see of Cujavia, he declined, proclaimed his adoption of the Reformation, and left his native country. Frisia...
became his first field of labor in the cause of his new faith. In 1542 he was appointed pastor of Emden, and superintendent of the whole country. The situation was difficult: on the one side, the Roman Catholics with their intrigues; on the other, the sectarians with their violence. But A Lasco was possessed of a great talent for administration and organization; and in the course of a few years he succeeded in founding and consolidating the Reformed Church on Reformed principles, and with a strongly marked system of discipline. In 1549 the Interim drove him away, and he went to London, where he founded the Foreign Protestant Congregation, whose constitution—Forma ac ratio tota ecclesiastici Ministerii,—London, 1556,—is an exact, living document. After the death of Edward VI. (in 1553) and the accession of Mary, that congregation was not allowed to live in London any longer. A Lasco hoped to find a safe refuge for his flock in Denmark; but having arrived at Elsinor in October, 1553, he learned that his congregation was not permitted to stay in the country during the winter. Under unspeakable sufferings, they were ordered to proceed farther; and when they finally, at Christmas, landed at Rostock and Lubeck, new and still harder persecutions were raised against them from the side of the Lutheran clergy and magistrates. Not until Easter, 1554, A Lasco succeeded in bringing his flock in haven at Emden. While preparing himself to spend the rest of his life at Emden, an invitation arrived from Poland, calling him home. King Sigismund August was favorably inclined towards the Reformation, and in 1558 A Lasco was settled at Krzycz as superintendent of the Reformed congregations of Little Poland. The principal fruit of his labors during those years was the Polish translation of the Bible, undertaken by a number of scholars under his supervision.

Lit. — The collected works of A Lasco were edited by A. Kuyper, Amsterdam, 1866, 2 vols. His life was written by Bortels (Elberfeld, 1861) and Dalton (Gotha, 1881). See also Krasinski: Sketch of the Reformation in Poland, London, 1874, 2 vols. 1.

LATERAN CHURCH AND COUNCILS.

The term "Lateran Councils" denotes generally all synods convened in the Lateran basilica in Rome, but refers more especially to those five which are recognized by the Church of Rome as ecumenical,—1123, 1139, 1179, 1215, and 1512. The name of the place points back to old Rome, one of whose most magnificent palaces was the Domus Lateranorum (Juven. Sat., 10, 17), which Nero confiscated because a member of the family, Flavius Lateranus, had taken part in a conspiracy against him (Tact. Annal., 15, 49, 52). Afterwards it was often inhabited by the emperors. Fausta, the second wife of Constantine, resided there. On the removal of the court to Constantinople, the emperor presented the Domus Faustina to the Bishop of Rome; and the successors of Sylvester lived there for nearly a thousand years,—until the emigration to Avignon. During that long period the structure was, of course, much altered: several chapels and basilicas were added. The old basilicas, built by Constantine the Great, was originally dedicated to Christ the Saviour (Saluator), but came in the sixth century to bear the name of St. John the Baptist. It was also called "Basilica Constantiana," after its founder; or "Basilica aurea," on account of its magnificence. It burnt down in the tenth century, and was rebuilt by Sergius III. The present structure dates from the middle of the seventeenth century. The Church of the Lateran is considered the mother-church of Christendom (Omnium Urbes et Orbis Ecclesiorum M. et Copae). It is the Papal cathedral, and every new Pope takes possession of it with great solemnity.

The first Lateran council (in the narrower sense of the words) took place in 1123, under Calixtus III. (Mansi: Concil. Collect., xxi. 49). The concordat, under which he had been settled since the indulgences granted to the crusaders by Urban II. were renewed; the consecrations performed by Burdin, the antipope, were annulled; the decrees against simony, marriage of the clergy, etc., were repeated. The second (1139), under Innocent II., laid the interdict upon King Roger of Sicily, excommunicated him, and permitted to stay in the country the Cathari and Waldensians, contains a confession of faith, in which the term transubstantiation occurs for the first time. The second decides the Trinitarian controversy between Petrus Lombardus and Joachim of Floris (in favor of the former). The thirteenth forbids the foundation of new monastical orders. The twenty-first decrees were issued. The first, directed against the Cathari and Waldensians, contains a confession of faith, in which the term transubstantiation occurs for the first time. The second decides the Trinitarian controversy between Petrus Lombardus and Joachim of Floris (in favor of the former). The thirteenth forbids the foundation of new monastical orders. The twenty-first decrees were issued. The first, directed against the Cathari and Waldensians, contains a confession of faith, in which the term transubstantiation occurs for the first time. The second decides the Trinitarian controversy between Petrus Lombardus and Joachim of Floris (in favor of the former). The thirteenth forbids the foundation of new monastical orders. The twenty-first decrees were issued. The first, directed against the Cathari and Waldensians, contains a confession of faith, in which the term transubstantiation occurs for the first time. The second decides the Trinitarian controversy between Petrus Lombardus and Joachim of Floris (in favor of the former). The thirteenth forbids the foundation of new monastical orders. The twenty-first decrees were issued. The first, directed against the Cathari and Waldensians, contains a confession of faith, in which the term transubstantiation occurs for the first time. The second decides the Trinitarian controversy between Petrus Lombardus and Joachim of Floris (in favor of the former). The thirteenth forbids the foundation of new monastical orders. The twenty-first decrees were issued. The first, directed against the Cathari and Waldensians, contains a confession of faith, in which the term transubstantiation occurs for the first time. The second decides the Trinitarian controversy between Petrus Lombardus and Joachim of Floris (in favor of the former). The thirteenth forbids the foundation of new monastical orders. The twenty-first decrees were issued. The first, directed against the Cathari and Waldensians, contains a confession of faith, in which the term transubstantiation occurs for the first time. The second decides the Trinitarian controversy between Petrus Lombardus and Joachim of Floris (in favor of the former).
bridge at the age of fourteen, he became fellow of Clare Hall in 1509. According to Strype, he was remarkable during his university career for the "sanctimony of his life." He was at that time a bitter opponent of the Reformation, and his bachelor's oration was directed against the views of Melaunchthon. Of the period he at a later time said from the pulpit, "I was as obstinate a Papist as any in England." Coming in contact, however, with Bilney, who heard his bachelor's oration, he was impressed with his confession of the faith of the Reformers, and finally accepted their views himself. As soon as his change of opinion became known, whole "swarms of friars and doctors," as Foxe puts it, "flocked against Master Latimer on every side." At Christmas, 1529, he delivered his famous sermons On the Card, in which he represents himself and congregation as playing at triumph,—a game of cards something like whist. These and other sermons attracted so much attention, and once and again, by God's grace, in the language of Cranmer, "He shall never be put out." His sufferings were soon brought to a close, while Ridley lingered for a considerable time.

Hugh Latimer was not a man of great learning: but his practical and bold advocacy of the principles of the Reformation made him one of the oratory of that movement; while his noble bearing in prison, and in the face of the flames, will forever enshrine him in the affections of his countrymen. With Hooper he was one of the most powerful preachers of his day in England. This power was derived from his bold temper, directness of statement, fearless denunciation of the extravagances of doctrine and immoralities of life of the clergy, and his sense of humor. Perhaps he approaches nearer than any of the English Reformers to Luther in the earnestness of his manner, the bluntness of his style, and the keen tone of his practical exhortations. "He spake nothing, but it left, as it were, certain pricks and stings in the hearts of his hearers, which moved them to consent to his doctrine. None but the stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart went away from his sermons without being affected with high detestation of sin," etc. (Becon: Jewel of Joy). He was plain of speech, and spared not the abuses of the Church of his day. He held, in general, to all the fundamental views of the Reformation,—the distinction of the Roman and the Catholic Church, the use of the vulgar tongue in worship, the abolition of the confessional, the spiritual conception of the sacraments, etc. One of the elements of his character upon which Dr. Tulloch lays just stress is his "Christ in the mass. On Oct. 16, 1555, he was led forth, with Ridley, to the stake, in front of Balliol College. He met his fate with great heroism; and his many words to his companion will always be remembered, with those of Tyndale at Vilvorde, as the most striking utterances of the English martyrs who suffered for their faith. "Be of good comfort, Master Ridley," he said: "play the man. We shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as, I trust, shall never be put out." His sufferings were soon brought to a close, while Ridley lingered for a considerable time.

LATIMER. LATIN LANGUAGE, USE OF THE, IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. Because it is the universal religion, Christianity cannot, like Judaism and Mohammedanism, confine itself to one language. In the East, the Greek, Coptic, Armenian, Arabic, Slavonian languages are used. In the West, the Roman-Catholic Church contended against the introduction of the vernacular tongues in the service as a danger and a profanation. The Council of Trent (Sess. IV.) recognizes only the Vulgate, the Latin translation of the Bible, as the authentic text of Holy Writ in questions of doctrine, in
cases of canon law, and in every-day use for devotional purposes and the cure of souls. Less exclusively the council expresses itself with respect to the use of the Latin language in the administration of the sacraments. It says, "Although the mass contains great instruction for the faithful people, nevertheless, it has not seemed expedient to the Fathers that it should be everywhere celebrated in the vulgar tongue." It enjoins, however, the explanation of the mysteries to the people, but anathematizes those who say "that the mass ought to be celebrated in the vulgar tongue only." (Sess. XXII. c. VIII. and can. ix. Compare Schaff, Creeds, ii. 183, 186.)

It was quite natural that the Church of Rome should adopt the Latin language, and carry it with her wherever she went. And during the early middle ages, when the modern European languages did not exist, but had barely entered into the process of formation, it was, no doubt, a great boon to European civilization, that there was a common language in which all public business could be transacted. Into the dark and chaotic fermentation, Latin brought the necessary light and cohesion. But there came a change. The languages gradually ripened into maturity, and the nations began to demand to have their most sacred interests served in the most effectual way. At first the popes seemed willing to assent. No objection was made to the use of the vernacular tongue when Cyrillus and Methodius converted Bohemia. But it was soon discovered, that, in the exclusive use of the Latin language, the Church of Rome possessed one of her most effective means of consolidation, and consequently she immediately became very imperious in its defence. The reasons with which she vindicated her protest are often curious, sometimes cynical, seldom just: they have been aptly summed up by Bellarmin: Oper. iii. 119.

With the Reformation, the popular demand for the vernacular tongue in divine service became more general; it was heard in regions where hitherto the Reformation had not penetrated. In the Church of England the abrogation of the Latin language in the administration of the Lord's Supper was one of the first acts of the Reformers (see art. 24 in the Thirty-nine Articles). In the Lutheran churches, Latin was banished from the altar and the pulpit for some time, but gradually disappeared. Towards the close of the eighteenth century and in the beginning of the nineteenth, a movement arose among the Roman Catholics in Germany, for the introduction of German into their service; but it was speedily quelled by the clergy. See G. Koffmann: Geschichte d. Kirchenleiters, Breslau, 1879 sqq.

LATIN VERSIONS. See Bible Versions.

LATITUDINARIANS, the designation of a school of opinion within the Church of England, which arose in the seventeenth century. It is applied somewhat indefinitely, to men who differed quite widely in their theological opinions, and yet agreed in manifesting a spirit of toleration towards the Dissenters, and were willing to admit liberty in the use of the forms of the Episcopal Church, and even a revision of the Liturgy, in the hope of winning the Dissenters. They were thus at the opposite extreme from the High-Churchmen. In the doctrinal part of religion they laid emphasis upon the fundamentals. Hales and Chillingworth, Cudworth, Theophilus Gale, Whitchurch, Tillotson, and perhaps Stillington, are among those who were classed as prominent representatives of this school. After the Restoration (1660) the school gained influence; some of its representatives being raised to high positions in the Church. The spiritual apathy and indifference in the Church of England in the eighteenth century has been pronounced as due to the influence of the Latitudinarians by Canon Ferry (History of the English Church, student's edition, vol. ii. 514 sq.) and others, but without good reason, unless it is fair to class in the same school with Archbishop Tillotson and Cudworth men who approached very close to the Socinians and Deists. The modern representative of the Latitudinarians is in the so-called "Broad Church" party in the Church of England. Those who are classed in this school are regarded as laying great stress upon the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, and the Christian temper of the daily life, as opposed to that view which emphasizes unduly a rigid conformity to a ritual, and are consequently tolerant towards members of other communions. S. T. Coleridge, Dr. Arnold, Jul. Ch. Hare, F. W. Maurice, Charles Kingsley, and Dean Stanley have been among the distinguished representatives of the Broad Church party. See TULLOCH: Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century, Edinburgh, 1875, 2 vols., vol. ii. pp. 6 sqq.; CHURTON: Latitudinarians from 1671 to 1787, London, 1881; and arts. Chillingworth, Cudworth, Platonists, Cambridge, High Church, Low Church.

LATOMUS is a name of frequent occurrence among the scholars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Two have special theological interest. — Jacobus Latomus (Jaques Masson), b. at Cambron, Hainault, in 1475; d. at Louvain, May 29, 1544. He studied theology in Paris, and was in 1514 appointed teacher of theology in the university of Louvain, and dean of St. Peter's. He was a zealous champion of scholasticism, more especially of the theology of Thomas, and attacked both the Humanists (especially Erasmus) and the Reformers, — Luther, Goclenius, Melanchthon, and Tyndal. A collected edition of his works was published at Louvain in 1566, under the name of Latomus, Louvain, 1550. — Bartholomum Latomus, b. at Arlon, Luxemburg, in 1485; d. at Coblenz in 1566. He taught Latin at Treves; rhetoric at Cologne, Freiburg, and Paris; visited Italy in 1539; and was in 1541 appointed councillor at the electoral court of Treves, residing at Coblenz. He was a philologist, but took also part in the theological controversies of the day, and wrote against Bucer, Andrea, and others: Briefe an J. Sturm über Kirchenpolitik u. Kirchenverordnung, etc. WAGENMANN.

LATTER-DAY SAINTS. See Mormon.

LAUD, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, and chief minister of state, in the reign of Charles I.; was b. Oct. 7, 1573, and d. (by the hands of the public executioner, under a bill of attainder, for high treason) Jan. 10, 1644. He was a native of Reading, Berkshire, educated at Magdalen College, Oxford, and became a master-cloth-cloven in good circumstances. His mother (by name, Lucy Webb) belonged to the same social class; and he could boast of an uncle, on the...
mother's side, who became lord-mayor of London, and received the honor of knighthood. Some of his enemies among them "illiam Prynne, the well-known Puritan, who early became a victim of Laud's implacable persecution) were used to say that he was born of "obscure parents,"—a charge, which, strangely enough, seems to have been peculiarly obnoxious to his feelings. Heylin, his chaplain and biographer, tells us, that, after Laud's implacable persecution) were used to say that he was born of "obscure parents,"—a charge, which, strangely enough, seems to have been peculiarly obnoxious to his feelings. Heylin, his chaplain and biographer, tells us, that, after Land's implacable persecution) were used to say that he was born of "obscure parents,"—a charge, which, strangely enough, seems to have been peculiarly obnoxious to his feelings. Heylin, his chaplain and biographer, tells us, that, after Laud was told by him that the cause was a printed sheet, which he had just received, reproaching him with "so base a parentage as if he had been raked out of a dunghill." The archbishop "added, withal, that, though he had not the good fortune to be born a gentleman, yet he thanked God he had been born of honest parents, who lived in a good condition, employed many poor people in their way, and left a good report behind them." (Cyprianus Anglicus, p. 43).

It was, however, chiefly to himself, rather than to any adventitious circumstances like those of birth, that William Laud owed the splendid success, no less than the most remarkable careers in the history of England.

He received the elements of his education in the free grammar-school of his native town, under a "very severe schoolmaster," who, however, already found in him the promise of future distinction. At the age of sixteen he was entered as a commoner at St. John's College, Oxford, at which college he obtained a scholarship in 1590 and a fellowship in 1594.

At college he was not only remarked for his ability, combined, it is said, with not a little self-confidence, but, under the most unfavorable circumstances, assumed the position in church policy which characterized his whole after-history. In no part of England had Puritanism, at the period now referred to, taken deeper root than at Oxford; what Heylin describes as the ultra Protestantism of the university having been chiefly due to the influence of Mr. Laurence Humphrey, president of Magdalen College, and professor of divinity. Laud was, Heylin says, of too stubborn a nature to give way to common opinions merely because they were common; and his studies in divinity had been "founded," as the same author states, "on the Holy Scriptures according to the glosses and interpretations of the ancient Fathers and other godly bishops of the primitive times." Accordingly, even in his college life, we find him asserting High-Church principles on every occasion, and already suspected of a leaning to Popery. When he was ordained, in 1601, by Young, Bishop of Rochester, the bishop "found his study raised above the system and opinions of the age, and the high office of chancellor of the university, in which latter capacity it was his duty and his pride to entertain, in 1636, the king and queen as his guests during a royal visit to Oxford. In the Church, as appears from entries in his diary, he must have early enjoyed large revenues from numerous benefices, many of them held in commendam, and retained even after he had been raised to the episcopal bench. But his principal preferments included the deanery of Gloucester (1616), the bishopric of St. David's (1621), the bishopric of Bath and Wells (1628), the deanery of the Chapel Royal (1626), the bishopric of London (1628), the deanery of Westminster, and the archbishopric of Canterbury and primacy of all England (1633). He was a statesman no less than a churchman, and in the State his advancement was equally signal. He became a privy councillor in 1627, and from that time held various high appointments in the administration of civil affairs, culminating in his selection, in the year 1628, for the office of chief minister of the state; the death of the famous Duke of Buckingham by the hands of the assassin Felton having paved the way for an elevation unprecedented in the case of any English ecclesiastic since the fall of Wolsey.

At the height of his fortune, the position of the son of the clothier of Reading must have transcended the most daring aspirations of his youth. As primate he was the first peer of the realm, being next in dignity to royalty; and in his case the high honors always appertaining to the chief minister of the Church were greatly augmented by the secular offices, hardly less lofty, which he sustained at court. "English nobles and foreign ambassadors," says Dean Hook (p. 228), "paid their court to him at Lambeth. The interior courts of his palace were filled with men-at-arms and horsemen; and while holding a levee,
LAUD.

or granting an interview, the archbishop himself held a court second only in grandeur to that of the king.

Above all, Laud reached an eminence, as regards power and influence, which could not fail to be peculiarly dear to him. It does not anywhere appear, that eager as he was for place, wealth, and honors, and indefatigable (perhaps not always very scrupulous) in their pursuit, he ever cared for you or for their own sakes. He seems to have been altogether free from the sordid ambition of vulgar place-hunters. He spent most of his large revenues during his life in splendid benefactions to the Church and his own university. It is to his honor that he died comparatively a poor man, and that, as appears from his will, such money or lands as remained to him at his death he bequeathed, not for the enrichment of his own family, but chiefly for the encouragement of religion and learning. He sought honors and high place as the means of accomplishing public benevolence, and more especially for the accomplishment of what he regarded as the true interests and welfare of the Church. In a great degree he gained the power of realizing, at least for a time, the dream of his college days. It is true that the results were disastrous, on the whole, at the moment at least, if not (for this is disputed) even in relation to the future; but, full of a great idea, he contrived to reach a place in the Church and in the State which enabled him for a time to make his will law.

What was his great aim throughout life can only be briefly indicated.

He had various projects apart from that predominating design, and many of these he accomplished. Among them was the erection of new buildings at St. John's College, Oxford; the repair of St. Paul's Cathedral Church, London; the annexing, in perpetuity, some commendations to ill-endowed bishoprics; the increase of the income of poor curates; the setting-up a Greek press in London and in Oxford for the purpose of printing the library manuscripts (many of them his own munificent gifts); and the erection of an Arabic lection at Oxford.

His great aim, however, was the re-organization of the Church of England as a whole, or its restoration, in doctrine and worship, to what he regarded as the purity of primitive times. It is not difficult to determine what was understood by Laud by primitive or patristic purity of worship and doctrine. He always disclaimed disloyalty to the Reformed Church of England, and any wish to restore Popery. At his trial he said, "I will die with these words in my mouth: that I never intended, much less endeavored . . . the bringing-in of Papish superstitions upon the true Protestant religion established in this kingdom." Nor have we any sufficient reason to impeach his honesty in this explicit disavowal of deliberate treachery. Neither, however, on the other hand, can it be reasonably questioned that the doctrines and usages which under the name of primitive or patristic Christianity, it was his great aim to introduce in the Church of England, were doctrines and usages unknown to the fathers of the English Reformation, and which in every case tended in one direction, and that direction Romanism. If not a Papist at heart, as so many (probably, in the strictest sense of the term, without warrant) suspected, it is at least very evident that all his predilections, as all his actual changed church policy, were in favor of the sacramentarian principles and ceremonial observances of the Church of Rome,—a church he always regarded, as, in his own words, "a true Church," "a Church which had never erred in fundamentals," "a true, but not an orthodox Church." All his innovations showed the same tendency. His own friends acknowledged that there was some difficulty in reconciling some of his proceedings with his professed character. "I would I knew where to find you," wrote Joseph Hall from Cambridge. "To-day you are in the tents of the Romanists, to-morrow in ours, the next day between both, against both." The truth appears to have been, that, while disavowing the authority of the Pope, the Church for which, under the name of the Church of England, Laud labored and suffered, would, if his own ideal had been fully carried out, have been Romanist in almost every thing but the name.

That some, at least, of the ceremonies and other innovations introduced by him, were at all events contrary to, or an advance upon, Protestantism, is, though denied by himself (Troubles and Trial,—Works, iii., 437), both admitted and insisted on by the modern representatives of the school of which he is the chief founder. "Laud's immediate acts and alms," writes Canon Moseley, in his able sketch of the life of Laud, "were most practical; and a great practical rise of the English Church was the effect of his career. . . . The Holy Table in all our churches, altar-wise, at the east end, is a visible memorial of Laud, which none can escape. It was not so before his time: it is not necessarily so by the rubric of our Church at this moment. . . . That any one of Catholic predilections can belong to the English Church is owing, so far as we can see, to Laud." But it is for the means he employed to carry it out, much more than for the aim he set before him, which was in itself, from an English Churchman's point of view, legitimate enough, that Laud will be generally condemned. The attempt to restore the Church by silencing Puritans and all nonconformists, as the indispensable condition of such a restoration, was the first principle of the Laudian policy. "The holy Church," wrote Wren, bishop of Norwich, "subsists not without the communion of saints. No communion with them, without union among ourselves. That union impossible, unless we preserve a uniformity for doctrine and a uniformity for discipline." (See Gardiner: Fall of the Monarchy, vol. i. p. 2.) The fact now referred to is of itself sufficient; and it is hardly necessary to go into the question, how, under Laud's rule, the repression of the nonconformists was carried out. He is said to have preferred persuasion to force; but it is not denied, that, when necessary, the most horrible severities were employed under his sanction to enforce conformity. The names of Leighton, Prynne, Bostwick, and Burton, are well known, with hundreds of cases of dissenters, who, if not shockingly mutilated, and condemned to perpetual imprisonment, were silenced, and compelled to seek liberty of conscience beyond seas, or, worse than all, to violate their own sense of duty, and lose their
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spiritual, in seeking to save their bodily, life and well-being. Nor is it disputed, that of the Star Chamber and Court of High Commission, by which these men were punished; Laud was the moving spirit; may, that if, in these courts, any voice was for more than ordinarily severe measures, it was sure to be his (Gardiner: Personal History, i. 6). But perhaps the worst charge against Laud in this connection is the alleged fact, that to gain the power of suppressing the non-conformists, and otherwise securing the restoration of a pure and catholic church according to his own ideal, Laud did not hesitate to encourage in the king those absolute principles, which, if he had prevailed, instead of the Parliament, would have been fatal to the liberties of the English people.

It need only be here further noted, that Laud’s prudence and sagacity were not by any means equal to his zeal as a statesman. Good intentions and bad management were said to be his characteristics. His whole life’s dream as to a united church in England was visionary and impracticable. This might have been all the more the case, had his policy of affairs ever been better illustrated than in his disastrous attempt to bring Scotland into the scheme of uniformity. The history of the Scottish canons of 1638 and the Scottish liturgy of 1637 cannot here be told at length. It was a delicate undertaking to introduce episcopacy into Scotland, and could only have been accomplished warily. But no prudence was exercised by Laud. The new canons and the new liturgy were open to two insuperable objections. In their subject-matter they were opposed to all the prepossessions of a people brought up in Presbyterianism; and, as regards the way in which they were introduced, they were especially obnoxious, having been founded on the royal prerogative alone, without consent of any of the national judicatories, who had, indeed, not been consulted. In Scotland, defeat and disgrace attended the policy of the archbishop, and by reasonable men nothing else could have been expected. It is an instructive fact, that, twenty years before the fatal Edinburgh riots of 1637, the same course, which, unhappily for himself, was adopted by Charles I., had been recommended by Laud to James I., who, however, had, with all his foolishness, too much sagacity to follow it, and afterwards expressed his judgment of its adviser. “The truth is,” he said when an appointment to a vacant bishopric was in question, “that I keep back Laud from all place of rule and authority, because he hath a restless spirit, and cannot see when matters are well, but loves to toss and change, and to bring things to a pitch of reformation floating in his own brain, which may endanger the steadfastness of that which is in good pass, God be praised!” He was a little man, of staid and cold manners, but in temper hasty and arrogant. He never married. His life, impeached by Prynne on the authority of some ambiguous expressions in his Diary and Private Devotions, appears to have been pure. Judging him by the prayers which he had composed for his secret use, he must have been a man of singular devoutness of spirit. As has already appeared, he was often rash and precipitate in public affairs; though otherwise his capacity for high office, whether in Church or State, was very great. Now far he deserved well of his Church and country as regards, if not the results, at least the intentions, of his policy, is a question on which there will always be difference of opinion.

His principal writings are: a Conference with Fisher, a Jesuit, published in 1628; Answer to the Speech of Lord Saye and Sele touching the Liturgy, 1635; Seven Sermons preached on Public Occasions, 1651; A Summary of Devotions, compiled and used by Dr. William Laud, now published according to the Copy written with his own Hand, 1667; History of the Troubles and Tryal of the most Revered Father in God and Blessed Martyr William Laud, written by Himself; 1683; several Speeches, and his Letters [very important, especially those to Lord Strafford].

LIT.—The Works of William Laud, D.D., in 7 vols., Oxford, 1853; Cyprianus Anglicus: or, the History of the Life of William Laud, etc., by F. Heylin, D.D., London, 1671; A Briefe of the Life of William Laud, compiled from the Verbatim, from his Own Diary and Other Writings out of his Own Hand, by William Prynne of Lincolnes Inn, Esq., London, 1844; Canterbury's Doome; or, the First Part of a Complete History of William Laud, by William Prynne, London, 1846; Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, by W. F. Hook, D.D., and man other documents form two volumes of the last and most complete edition of his works. His death was every way worthy of one, who, whatever may have been his faults, was unquestionably a great, and in many respects a good man. His last words avouched his loyalty to the Church of England. “The last particular, for I am not willing to be too long, is,” he said, “myself. I was born and baptized in the Church of England, established by law, and in that I come now to die.” After he had laid his head upon the block, he cried aloud, “Lord, receive my soul.” This was the signal agreed upon with the executioner; and, as the words were spoken, his head was set down by the body at a single blow. It was his wish that he might be buried in his own college; and though first interred in the Church of All Hallows, near the Tower, his remains were, after the Restoration, transferred to the Chapel of St. John’s, Oxford, and there deposited beneath the altar...
LAUNAY.
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LAUNAY, Pierre de, b. at Blois in 1573; d. in Paris, June 29, 1631. He held an important position in the civil service of his country, but retired in 1613 into private life, and devoted his whole time to the study of the Bible. He wrote paraphrases of the Epistles of Paul, the prophets, his history, etc.; carried on a long controversy with Amyrault concerning Chiliasm, of which he was an ardent adherent; and partook with great zeal in the general life of the Reformed Church in France. His principal work, however, was not published until after his death,—Remarques sur le texte de la Bible, Geneva, 1667. This work cost him twenty years of labor. It is intended to explain the difficult words, phrases, and figures of the Bible by grouping them together under appropriate heads, and translating them with their context, with due attention, or giving grammatical explanations. It has its uses still, although, of course, largely superseded.

LAUNOF, Jean de, b. at Valognes, in Normandy, Dec. 21, 1603; d. in Paris, March 10, 1675. He was ordained a priest in 1633, and took his degree as doctor of divinity in 1636; but he never held a benefice. He lived in retirement, and devoted himself exclusively to literature. His principal works treat of historical subjects, and were written partly in defence of the liberties of the Gallican Church, partly in pursuit of general critical principles, attacking titles to saintship, apostolical foundation, etc. His method he defended in his De autoria negantiam argumentu, 1653. A list of his works is found in E. Du Pin: Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques, xviii. p. 58.

LAURA, like cœnobium, denotes a monastic community, but with the difference, that, in the laura, the cells are separate structures, and the inmates live in solitude, meeting each other only on the first and last days of the week for common services in the chapel. Thus the laura, which was found only in Egypt, Syria, and Palestine, forms a transition between the hermitage and the cœnobium, or monastery. The etymology of the word is uncertain. The most probable derivation is from labra (labra), a term frequently used in Alexandria for an alley or small court.

LAURENTIUS, St., a pupil of Sixtus II., deacon of the Church of Rome, was martyred in the Valerian persecution (258) a few days after his master. The Roman prefect, having heard that the Christian Church was in possession of great treasures, demanded that Laurentius should surrender them. Laurentius seemed willing to comply with the demand; was released, and returning with a host of old, poor, and sick people, paupers and cripples, said, "There are our treasures." The prefect felt insulted, and sentenced Laurentius to be roasted to death over a slow fire; and the Christians of Rome actually saw and heard how "his living limbs hissed over the coals." His festival is celebrated on Aug. 10. See Ambrose: De offic. ministr., i. 41, ii. 28; and Prudentius: Hymn. in Lau.

TH. PRESSEL.

LAURENTIUS, antipope to Symmachus (498). He was an arch-presbyter in Rome, and the choice of the imperial party, and was actually ordained by the Bishop of Rome (Nov. 22, 498) as successor of Anastasius II. The Roman party chose Symmachus, the king of the Ostro-Goths, who decided in favor of Symmachus; and Laurentius was made bishop of Nocera (498); but, principally in consequence of his machinations against Symmachus, although the charge of Eutychianism was brought against him, he was deposed (501), and died in exile about 520.

LAURENTIUS VALLA (Lorenzo della Valle), humanist, philologist, exegete, and critic; b. in Rome, 1400 or 1407; d. there Aug. 1, 1457. He received a very careful education; was ordained priest in 1431; published in 1436 his first book, Dialogi III. de voluptate, which attracted much attention; and was appointed professor eloquentiae at the university of Pavia, where he published the two famous books, Questions dialecticae and De elegantia Latina sermonum,—open denunciations of the logic taught in the schools and of the style employed in literature. The professors became furious, not only the theologians, but also the philosophers and the jurists. Valla left Pavia, and for some time he led a rather erratic life in Milan, Genoa, and Florence, until, in 1436, he entered the service of King Alfonso V. of Aragon, as his secretary. As the king sided with the Council of Basel against Pope Eugenius IV., Laurentius saw fit to publish his book, Declamatio de false credita et ementeria Constantini donatione. In 1442 Alfonso took possession of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, and Laurentius took up his abode in Naples. But his denials of the genuineness of the correspondence between Christ and King Abgarus, and of the Epistola Lentuli, and his further denial of the apostolical authorship of the Symbolum apostolicum, and of the identity of Dionysius of Athens with the author of the "apocryphal" writings, excited the monks and priests and professors to such a degree, that he was summoned before the Inquisition. The king saved him. No process was instituted; and Laurentius went on increasing the scandal by furnishing a list of errors found in the Vulgate, of mistakes made by St. Jerome, and of heresies picked from the writings of St. Augustine. Nevertheless, he wished to quit Naples, and live in Rome. The first attempt he made of settling there, in 1444, when Eugenius and Alfonso had been reconciled, failed, as the lower clergy inclined the mob against him; and he was his first book, Dialogi III. de voluptate, which attracted much attention; and was appointed professor eloquentiae at the university of Pavia, where he published the two famous books, Questions dialecticae and De elegantia Latina sermonum,—open denunciations of the logic taught in the schools and of the style employed in literature. The professors became furious, not only the theologians, but also the philosophers and the jurists. Valla left Pavia, and for some time he led a rather erratic life in Milan, Genoa, and Florence, until, in 1436, he entered the service of King Alfonso V. of Aragon, as his secretary. As the king sided with the Council of Basel against Pope Eugenius IV., Laurentius saw fit to publish his book, Declamatio de false credita et ementeria Constantini donatione. In 1442 Alfonso took possession of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, and Laurentius took up his abode in Naples. But his denials of the genuineness of the correspondence between Christ and King Abgarus, and of the Epistola Lentuli, and his further denial of the apostolical authorship of the Symbolum apostolicum, and of the identity of Dionysius of Athens with the author of the "apocryphal" writings, excited the monks and priests and professors to such a degree, that he was summoned before the Inquisition. The king saved him. No process was instituted; and Laurentius went on increasing the scandal by furnishing a list of errors found in the Vulgate, of mistakes made by St. Jerome, and of heresies picked from the writings of St. Augustine. Nevertheless, he wished to quit Naples, and live in Rome. The first attempt he made of settling there, in 1444, when Eugenius and Alfonso had been reconciled, failed, as the lower clergy inclined the mob against him; and he was compelled to flee. But in 1447, after the accession of Nicholas V., he succeeded in getting a foothold in Rome; and he remained there to his death, translating the Iliad, Thucydidcs, etc., and carrying on his controversy with Poggio,— Inctica in Valla, Antidot in Poggium (two books, so rude, so coarse, so indecent, that it is rather hard to understand how such things could be written and published at the papal court; and yet Antidot in Poggium was dedicated to the Pope, and its author was appointed Secretary apostolicus). Among the Italian humanists, Laurentius occupies a place of his own. He was not only a philologist or an archaeologist, he was a critic, and an excellent critic; and it is not altogether without reason that Bellarmine designates him as a precursor Lutheri. His works were among the first which the newly invented printing-press
spread over the world. His *Declamatio* was first printed without date or place, and then, in 1517, by Hutten, with a dedication to Leo X. Erasmus edited his *Annotationes in N. T.*, Paris, 1505. Collected editions of his works (though not complete) appeared at Basel, 1540-43, and Venice, 1592.

_Lit._—See *Tiraboschi: Storia della lett. ital.* vi. 3. Independent monographs have been written by *Christoph. Poggiali* (*Piacenza, 1700*), *J. Wildschut* (*Leyden, 1830*), *Joh. Clausen* (*Copenhagen, 1861*), and *D. G. Monrad* (*Gotha, 1861*). *WAGENMANN.*

**LAVATER, Johann Kaspar**, a distinguished Swiss divine, poet, physiognomist, and philanthropist; the twelfth child of a physician; b. in Zürich, Nov. 15, 1741; d. in Zürich, Jan. 2, 1801.

As a child he was awkward, dreamy, and misunderstood. He early displayed a decided religious nature, and devoted much time to the study of the Bible. After studying theology in Zürich, he became widely known by his spirited denunciation of the *Landvogt*, Felix Grebel, formalver of the church at the Orphan-house at Zürich. In 1763 he went, in company with two friends, to Germany, and studied with Spalding in Pomerania,—the best representative of the Pietistic revival. It was not till 1768 that he received his first appointment as deacon of the church at the Orphan-house at Zürich. In 1786 he became pastor of the great St. Peter's Church. He was very popular as a preacher, effective as a pastor, and beloved as a man; so that no inducement—not even the flattering call that no inducement—not even the flattering call at the Orphan-house at Zürich. His sermons, many of which were published, are not models, but are characterized by earnestness, biblicalunction, and clear testimony to Jesus Christ. He attracted a large circle of friends, both at home and abroad. Not to speak of others, we mention Goethe, Herder, Hamann, Fr. Stolberg, Oberlin, and Hasenkamp, with whom he maintained a regular correspondence; and that with Goethe, Herder, and Hasenkamp, has been published. Goethe once said of him, "He is the best, greatest, wisest, and sincerest of all the men that I know." But after Lavater's visit to him in Weimar, in 1786, their friendship cooled.

Lavater was a voluminous writer, but his greatness does not depend upon his literary achievements. He wrote far too much and too superficially. He is his own gosip, "night-gown style" (*Schlafrockmaner*) which he condemned in others. Nevertheless, many a rich gold vein glitters from the dull quartz of his composition. He made his *début* as a poet, and continued to write poetry till his dying hour. He composed many hymns; the best-known collection of which appeared under the title, *200 christl. Lieder* ("Two Hundred Christian Hymns"). [One of his best, which is very popular where German congregations have it, is, *Und du, Christ, du bleibst mein* ("And thou, Jesus Christ, grow thon in me.")] With Klopstock for a master, he composed the *Apocalypse* (1780), and paraphrases of the Gospels and Epistles in epic verse [*Jesus Messias, oder d. Evangelien u. Apostelgesch. in Gedichten*, 1783-86]. He was engaged for a long time over a philosophical poem on the future life, but published in its stead four volumes under the title *Aussichten in d. Ewigkeit* ("Outlooks into Eternity"), in which he gives his imagination the rein, and pictures a good many things about which the Bible is silent. He excelled most, however, as a composer of brief proverbial lines, and published several volumes of this kind, — *Solomon* (or doctrines of wisdom), 1785, and *Vermischte unphysiognomischen Regeln zur Menschenkenntnis*, 1787-88 ("Miscellaneous Unphysiognomic Rules for judging of Men"), which have not been surpassed. Lavater wrote extensively in the department of the practical philosophy of life. In this connection it is interesting to note his relations with Mendelssohn the philosopher. Lavater had translated Bonnet's *Palingenesia*, and, regarding his arguments for God's existence irrefutable, he dedicated the book to Mendelssohn, with the demand that he should either refute the arguments, or honorably acknowledge the truth, and become a Christian. To this the philosopher very coolly replied, that his religion, philosophy, and civil relations, alike obliged him to avoid controversies about the merits of particular religions. His greatest work, and the one by which his name is best known to the world was the *Physiognomic Fragments to advance the Knowledge of Men and Love amongst Men*), which appeared in four large volumes (1775-78), enriched with innumerable pictures and silhouettes. The author here seeks to build up a science of physiognomy from the judgments which men form from the lineaments of the face. He started from the principle that these correspond to the feelings of the heart. The manuscript was sent to Goethe, who added some sections; as, for example, the one on the physiognomies of animals. Lavater was confident that his work would contribute to the welfare of mankind, and spent not only much labor, but much of his income, upon it, and in gathering a collection of engravings, silhouettes, etc., of celebrated men, which is said to be preserved to this day in Vienna. Of his other writings, *Ponitias Pilatus* (1782-85, 4 vols.) and *Nathanael* (1786) are to be mentioned. Both are apologetic. The former answered Pilate's question, "What is truth?" from the teachings of Christ about God, the Devil, the Son of God, the forgiveness of sins, etc.: the latter, directed to persons of honest hearts, adduces those who believed in Christ as the witnesses for the power of his gospel. Besides these works, he wrote a great number of smaller works of a devotional character, some of which are used to this day.

Lavater was a strictly evangelical divine, and became the object of ridicule from some quarters by his strict views of inspiration, the gifts of the Spirit, the value of prayer, etc. He avoided dogmatic forms of expression, and laid far more stress on biblical than on theological orthodoxy. He was also an ardent patriot, and, during the French Revolution and the subsequent wars, took a bold course against the rule of the French in Switzerland. He was taken prisoner, for a patriotic sermon, to Basel. His return to Zürich, on the 16th of August, 1799, was hailed by a general jubilation; but, after the battle with Massena in Zürich (Sept. 25), he was shot through the breast by a French grenadier, without provocation and while engaged on an errand of mercy. He lin-
LAYER. The laver which stood in the court of the Israelitish sanctuary, between the tabernacle of the congregation and the altar, was a round brass vessel, with open top, and stood on feet of brass. It served for the washing of the hands and feet of the priests when they went into the tabernacle, or when they came near to the altar to minister, "that they die not." This symbolic ceremony of purification was to remind them always that they were to come before the Lord cleansed from all defilements which occur in the daily transactions of life, and that they were not to enter the tabernacle with unсанctified feet, nor were they to minister with unholy hands, which would be sacrilege of the most holy, worthy of death (comp. Exod. xxx. 22; Lev. ix. 20). According to Exod. xxxv. 24 sq., xxxviii. 8, the women who served in the sanctuary furnished the material by dedicating the brass of their brazen looking-glasses. Such glasses were fastened somewhere to the brass. It served for the washing of the hands and feet of the priests when they went into the tabernacle, or when they came near to the altar to minister, "that they die not." This symbolic ceremony of purification was to remind them always that they were to come before the Lord cleansed from all defilements which occur in the daily transactions of life, and that they were not to enter the tabernacle with unsanctified feet, nor were they to minister with unholy hands, which would be sacrilege of the most holy, worthy of death (comp. Exod. xxx. 22; Lev. ix. 20). According to Exod. xxxv. 24 sq., xxxviii. 8, the women who served in the sanctuary furnished the material by dedicating the brass of their brazen looking-glasses. Such glasses were fastened somewhere to the laver, to serve the priestly symbol that purification and sanctification must be preceded by self-examination. The Septuagint and Samaritan Pentateuch have in Num. iv. 14, an additional passage, which prescribes that the laver was to be packed in a purple cloth, protected by a skin covering. In Solomon's temple there were ten lavers (1 Kings vii. 38).

LEYER. LAW OF MIGS. See MoseS; THORAH.

LAW, Natural. See NATURAL LAW.

LAW, William, b. at King's Cliff, Northamptonshire, 1866; d. there April 9, 1761; one of the most eminent English writers on practical divinity in the eighteenth century. He was educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow, and in 1711 received holy orders. He was a fearless non-juror, and, in consequence of his refusal to take the oaths of allegiance and abjuration on the accession of George I., forfeited his fellowship, and all prospects of advancement in the Church, which he loved so dearly in the midst of the staring red-brick buildings of a brand-new manufacturing town," says Mr. Overton, his latest and best biographer.

Law is best known by his Serious Call, a work of singular power. With the exception of The Pilgrim's Progress, no book on practical religion in the language has, perhaps, been so highly praised. Gibbon, Dr. Johnson, Dodridge, and John Wesley, vie with each other in commending it as a masterpiece. At one time, Law was a kind of oracle with Wesley, and his influence upon early Methodism was of an almost formative character. Afterwards a rupture occurred between these two great and good men. In his later years, Law became an enthusiastic student of Jacob Behmen, the pious, simple-hearted Teutonic theosophist; but his strong churchly feeling and his sound English sense kept him from the wild errors and extravagances into which some of Behmen's disciples fell, and stood on feet of brass. It served for the washing of the hands and feet of the priests when they went into the tabernacle, or when they came near to the altar to minister, "that they die not." This symbolic ceremony of purification was to remind them always that they were to come before the Lord cleansed from all defilements which occur in the daily transactions of life, and that they were not to enter the tabernacle with unsanctified feet, nor were they to minister with unholy hands, which would be sacrilege of the most holy, worthy of death (comp. Exod. xxx. 22; Lev. ix. 20). According to Exod. xxxv. 24 sq., xxxviii. 8, the women who served in the sanctuary furnished the material by dedicating the brass of their brazen looking-glasses. Such glasses were fastened somewhere to the laver, to serve the priestly symbol that purification and sanctification must be preceded by self-examination. The Septuagint and Samaritan Pentateuch have in Num. iv. 14, an additional passage, which prescribes that the laver was to be packed in a purple cloth, protected by a skin covering. In Solomon's temple there were ten lavers (1 Kings vii. 38).
probably did not receive an apostolic visit until it had been several years in existence (Acts xi. 19-26). The same, in all probability, was true of the church at Rome and at many other places. Doubtless, the greater simplicity of primitive church worship encouraged unofficial effort in their assemblies, which resembled our prayer-meetings more than our Lord's Day worship; and the energy of their faith and the fervor of their love sent them forth to preach the Saviour. Hatch says, "It is clear, from both the Acts of the Apostles and St. Paul's Epistles, that 'liberty of prophesying' prevailed in the apostolic age. It is equally clear that [it] existed after the apostolic age. In the first place, one of the most interesting monuments of the second century consists of a sermon or homily [the so-called Second Epistle of Clement], which was preached, probably, by a layman at Rome. In the second place, the Apostolic Constitutions [8, 31], which were of even later date, expressly contemplate the existence of preaching by laymen. Even if a teacher be a layman, still if he be skilled in the word, and reverent in habit, let him teach '" (Organization of the Early Christian Church, pp. 114, 115). But little by little those members of the Christian churches who did not hold office were excluded from the performance of almost all ecclesiastical functions. At first a layman might not preach if a bishop were present, and then not if any church-officer was present, and finally not at all" (Hatch, p. 124). Here and there one was found who asserted his right to be heard. Origen (d. 254), while a layman, preached before the Bishop of Caesarea. Tertullian (d. 245) maintained in its fullest sense the priesthood of all Christians, and their consequent right to teach; for he says, "Are not we laics priests? It is written, 'A kingdom also, and priests to his God and Father, hath he made us.' It is the authority of the Church, and the honor which has acquired sanctity through the joint session of the order, which has established the difference between the order and the laity. Where three are, a church is, albeit they be laics" (De Ex. Cost., vii.). Lay preaching was likewise defended by Augustine and Chrysostom. It seems to have been first prohibited by Leo the Great, in the interests of ecclesiastical order. (See Hatch, p. 115 n.) But preaching died out in the Catholic Church, until the preaching orders, such as the Dominican and Franciscan (which were composed of laymen), revived the practice in the thirteenth century. In the various sects which from time to time broke loose from the trammels of the Catholic Church, lay effort in promulgating their tenets was relied upon; and when the Protestant, especially the Calvinistic, churches arose, lay preaching was again sanctioned. Martin Chemnitz, Johann Arndt, and Johann Gerhard, among the Lutherans, defended it; and they were by no means alone. Pietism in the seventeenth century took it up, and in some quarters threw it into disfavor. Wesley was the great restorer of lay preaching. The wonderful movement he inaugurated would have completely failed, had he trusted entirely to an ordained ministry. But he wisely allowed great liberty to all who were piously inclined, and gifted, in and the consequence was, that Methodism marvellously spread. (See Local Preachers.) In quite modern times several lay preachers (e.g., Moody, Brownlow North, Murphy) have achieved great celebrity.

The lay preacher has the clearest scriptural warrant; and he has several manifest advantages over the regular minister, as that the reproach of being paid to uphold a certain doctrine does not lie against him, and that he will naturally be more in sympathy with those whom he addresses, for he will be more or less practically acquainted with their businesses or occupations. But to offset these advantages are certain disadvantages, such as an uncritical, and therefore probably defective, knowledge of the Bible, causing him to trust implicitly to the letter of his vernacular Scriptures, even when the translation is confessedly inaccurate; a lack of systematic training in logic and rhetoric, leading to undue emphasis upon popular, and yet, it may be, flimsy arguments in defence of Christianity; a lack of appreciation of scholarship, followed, probably, by resentment at views differing from the traditional. The lay preacher is, of course, beset by the same temptations as the regular minister. If he is successful in attracting attention, he is tempted to attribute too little to God, and to be puffed up by his success. On the other hand, if he is not successful, he is tempted to attribute the failure to malign influences, rather than to his lack of ability.

Lay preaching is an adjunct to clerical preaching, not a substitute for it. In the hands of wise and devout ministers, the lay preacher can be a powerful agent for God; but, if ill directed, he becomes a power for the spread of bigotry, fanaticism, and cant.

LAY REPRESENTATION. The right of the laity to a voice in the government of the church was recognized in apostolic times; for lay elders and deacons were chosen in and by each congregation, subject to the approval of the apostles. In the apostolic council of Jerusalem the entire church participated. But, with the rise of sacerdotalism, the laity declined in power, until they were entirely ignored in the church councils: indeed, the Council of Trent anathematizes the Scripture idea of the priesthood of all believers. Luther broke the string which tied the tongue of the laity, and introduced the novelty of lay representation. It is not yet realized in all denominations; although all, or at least nearly all, the churches in America provide for it. In Germany and other Lutheran countries, the Lutheran Church is governed by boards (consistories), composed of clergy and laymen. In England, the church is governed by laymen, so far as its affairs are controlled by the Crown and Parliament. In Ireland, laymen are regularly sent to the church convocations. In the Episcopal Church of the United States, three lay delegates are sent from each parish to the annual diocesan convention. In the general convention, which meets every three years, there is, in the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, an equal number of clerical and lay delegates, elected by the diocesan conventions.

In the Presbyterian churches throughout the world, the laity have representation in, (1) the Session, composed of the pastor and the elders, both elected by the congregation; (2) in Presbyteries, composed of the ministers, and one elder
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from each congregation in a certain district; (3) in Synod, composed of all the ministers and one elder from each congregation, embracing several presbyteries; (4) in General Assembly, composed of ministers and elders in equal numbers, elected by Presbytery. In the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America, similar courts exist; but they are named differently, being called Consociations, Parties, Synods, and the General Synod respectively. The constitution of the first two is similar to that just described. The two last are delegate bodies, and so the laity have less numerous representatives; but, as the number of ministers and elders is equal, they have more equal representation.

In churches of the Congregational order (Congregationalists, Baptists, Universalists, Unitarians) the laity have full representation. In the Wesleyan-Methodist Church of England there is no lay representation; but in the Methodist-Episcopal Church in the United States there are one or two lay delegates for each annual conference, chosen by an electoral conference of laymen, composed of one layman from each circuit or station within the bounds of the annual conference; such laymen being chosen by the preceding quarterly conference. The lay and ministerial delegates sit together, but may vote separately.

LAYING ON OF HANDS. See IMPATION OF HANDS.

LAZARISTS, a congregation of the Roman-Catholic Church, founded in 1624 by St. Vincent de Paul, authorized to reside and labor in France in 1644, and confirmed as an independent religious order by Urban VIII. Their original name was "Priests of the Mission." The name of "Lazarists" originated from the house in Paris, Collège de St. Lazare, which they obtained in 1832. Their objects were to do mission-work among the rural population and in foreign countries, especially Barby, and to educate young priests. At the time of the outbreak of the revolution, the congregation numbered eleven hundred and ninety-five members, and had sixty-three establishments in France, and as many in foreign countries, especially in Poland. Dissolved by the Convention, its congregation was restored by Napoleon in 1804; again dissolved in 1806, it was again restored in 1816.

LEADE, Jane, founder of the Philadelphian Society; b. in Norfolk, Eng., 1828; d. in London, Aug. 18, 1704. Her maiden name was Ward, but she married William Lead, her first cousin, in 1644. Her conversion took place in her sixteenth year; and she at once gave herself up to a life of prayer and meditation. Her married life was happy and blessed. But in 1670 her husband died, her fortune was lost to her by treachery, and thus her mystical tendency was confirmed by poverty and loneliness. She joined a congregation of mystics in London (among whom was Dr. Pordage), in obedience to visions, as she claimed, and became their leader. In 1670 she founded the Philadelphian Society (see art.), and in 1680 she began to publish her revelations, and in the interpretation of Scripture. In 1699 she became blind, but her visions continued. When she perceived her end drawing near, she dictated her own funeral sermon. Her numerous writings are in the line of Bohme's,—very mystical (she prophesied the coming of Christ would take place about 1700), very mystical, often obscure. She is honored by many of them to form a society of true Christians gathered from all sects. Her writings are at present very scarce. Perhaps the best of them are The Wonders of God's Creation manifested in the Variety of Eight Worlds, as they were made known experimentally to the Author (London, 1809). See PHILADELPHIANSociety, and, for a complete list and analysis of her writings, see HOCHHUTH: Jane Leade und die philadelphische Gemeinde in England, in Zeitschrift für die hist. Theologie, vol. xxxv. (1865), pp. 171-290.

LEADERS, AND LEADERS' AND STEWARDS' MEETINGS. A "leader," in Methodist parlance, is one who has charge of a "class," composed of a certain section of the communicants of the congregation. The leader meets them statedly, and examines into their spiritual condition, and, if any are absent, ascertains the cause: in short, acts as a pastor to them. It is evident that piety and common sense are indispensable requisites in a good leader. The leaders are appointed by the persons in charge of the respective circuits, and are responsible to them. These persons also examine the leaders at least once a quarter, and, if as often as practicable, meet the leaders and stewards in what is known as "leaders' and stewards' meetings." See METHODISM.

LEANDER, St., b. at Cartagena in the middle of the sixth century; d., probably, March 13, 507, at Ferrara. He was an elder brother of Isidore, and entered very early into a monastery. As instrumental in the conversion, from Arianism to Catholicism, of Hermenegild, a son of Leovigild, king of the Visigoths, he was banished, and went to Byzantium, where he made the acquaintance of Gregory the Great. On his return to Spain, he was made archbishop of Seville, 584; in which position he continued to labor zealously in the interest of the Catholic Church. He seems to have been instrumental, also, in the conversion of Reccared, the second son of Leovigild, and his successor, 587. At all events, he presided over the national council of Toledo (660), at which the wholeVisigothicnation abandoned Arianism, the national council of Toledo (586), at which the whole Visigothic nation abandoned Arianism, and entered the Catholic Church. It was also at this synod that the Filiquote first was introduced in the creeds of the Western Church. Of the works of Leander, mentioned by Isidore,—De vir. illust., 41,—only his Regula seu de institutione virginitatem (Holsten: Cod. reg., iii.) and Homilia de triumpho eccliesiee (Mansi) are still extant. See the art. by Görres, in Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte (1872) and Zeitschrift fur histor. Theologie (1873).

LEANDER VAN ESS. See Ess, VAN.

LEAVEN. The use of leaven is very old, certainly as early as Abraham's day; for the reason why Lot offered his angel guests unleavened bread was his haste (Gen. xix. 3). Its general use in Egypt is proved by Exod. xii. 34, 39. Different articles were used for leaven,—yeast, wine-berries, etc. Leaven must not be used in the cakes used in the Passover (Exod. xxix. 2; Lev. ii. 4, 11, vii. 12 sqq.), except in the two wave-loaves of the Feast of Pentecost, the representatives of the ordinary daily bread (Lev. xxiii. 17). During the Passover no leaven-
must be found in any house (Exod. xii. 15, 19; cf. 1 Cor. v. 7). The explanation of these enactments is easy. The bread of Passover is the bread of opposition to a reminder of their suffering during the bondage of Egypt, and of the haste of the exodus, and also of the truth that the old leaven of wickedness must be put out of the heart of those who would serve God in newness of spirit: there must not be left the least trace of the old, lest it should lead to a return to the old bondage. The etymology of the word in Hebrew and Greek favors the idea, that, symbolically speaking, the primary idea of leaven was its intense, permeating, and transforming power, while that of wickedness is secondary. In our Lord's use of the figure in the parable (Luke xiii. 21) the primary signification is that seized upon. LEYRER.

LEAVITT, Joshua, b. in Heath, Mass., Sept. 8, 1794; d. in Brooklyn, N.Y., Jan. 16, 1873. He was graduated at Yale College, 1810; studied law; after two years' practice, abandoned it for theology in Yale Divinity School, 1823, and was ordained in the Congregational ministry; was pastor in Stratford, Conn., 1825-28; secretary of the Seamen's Friend Society, New-York City, 1828-31; editor and proprietor of the New-York Antislavery Society. In 1837 he edited the Emancipator; removed to Boston 1841, and there started the Daily Chronicle, the first daily antislavery paper. In 1848 he became managing editor of The Independent, and wrote for it until his death. "He was the first lecturer sent out by the American Temperance Society. He edited the Christian Lyre, the first hymn-book published in America with the notes attached."

LEBANON probably received its name, "the white mountain," from the circumstance that several of its peaks are covered with snow for the larger part of the year (Jer. xviii. 14), though Robinson derives the name from the whitish or gray color of the Jurassic limestone, which forms the bulk of its mass. The system consists of two ranges, — Lebanon proper and Anti-Lebanon, — enclosing the plateau of Coalesyria, the present Jezreel, the present Bekaa. Lebanon proper, the western range, begins in the south at the River Litani, the ancient Leontes, and ends in the north at the River Nahar-el-Kebir, the ancient Lotheron. Gradually rising in terraces from the shore of the Mediterranean, it reaches an average height of from six thousand to eight thousand feet. Its highest peak, Jebel Mukhmel, is ten thousand two hundred feet; Sannin, nine thousand feet. The line of cultivation runs at an elevation of about six thousand feet. The descent towards El-Bukka'a is abrupt. Anti-Lebanon, the eastern range, begins in the south at Mount Hermon, and runs north-east, nearly parallel with Lebanon, gradually losing itself east in the plains of Palmlyra, north in the steppe of Homs. Anti-Lebanon is barren and forestless, and the Lebanon is exceedingly fertile and fascinating.

The country covered by these mountains never belonged to the Israelites, though it is mentioned (Josh. xiii. 5) as a territory which should be conquered, and though parts of Southern Lebanon really seem to have been subjugated during the reign of Solomon (1 Kings ix. 19; Cant. iv. 8). It is generally mentioned simply as the northern boundary of Judea (Deut. i. 7, xi. 24; Josh. i. 4, ix. 1); but Lebanon proper is often spoken of with admiration as a fertile land with thick forests (Ps. lixii. 16; Isa. x. 34), charming by its fresh fragrance (Cant. iv. 11), its wine (Hos. xiv. 7), its abundance of water (Cant. iv. 15), and rich in game (2 Kings xiv. 9; Isa. xl. 16). Its beauty evidently made a deep impression on the imagination of the Israelites. To the mind of the prophets, it presented itself as a symbol of the sublime (Isa. xxxvii. 24), or the firm and steady (Ps. xxix. 6; Hos. xiv. 5). They praise its "glory" (Issa. xxxv. 2), and to their eyes its depictions depict the desolation of the days of evil (Isa. xxxix. 9) and the restoration at the coming of the Messiah (Isa. xxix. 17). In the oldest times these regions were inhabited by the Hivites and the Gibeonites (Josh. xiii. 5, 6; Judg. iii. 3). Lebanon belonged to Phoenicia; Anti-Lebanon, to Damascus. In the fourth century before Christ the whole country was incorporated with the kingdom of the Seleucids, and later on it ran the gauntlet through the Roman, Saracen, and Turkish rule. At present Lebanon is inhabited by Christians (Maronites and Druses); Anti-Lebanon, by Mohammedans. A list of the whole literature pertaining to the subject is given in Ritte: Erdenkunde, vol. 17. See especially Robinson: Biblical Researches, Boston, 1841; Porter: Five Years in Damascus, London, 1855; Fraas: Drei Monate im Libanon, Stuttgart, 1876, 2d ed., 1877.

LEB'BUES. See JUDAS.

LEBRIA, Elius Antonius de, generally called Nabriensis, from Lebrix, or Lebria, the old Nebriosa on the Gaudalquiver; b. 1442 or 1444; d. July 2, 1522. Allured to Italy by the revival of classical studies, he stayed for ten years. After his return to his native country, he was teacher, first at Salamanca, afterwards at Alcala, fighting for the cause of the humanists against the schoolmen, and even against the Inquisition, from whose grasp Cardinal Ximenes tried to rescue him. He wrote a Latin grammar and dictionary, a historical work on the reign of Ferdinand the Catholic, etc., and was one of the principal contributors to the Complutensian Polyglot. See J. B. Mitsos, in Memorias de la real academia de la historia, 3, 1-30.

LEBUIN, or LIAFWIN (Latin, Livinus, not to be confounded with another Livinus, who, a century earlier, preached Christianity in Flanders, and is the patron saint of Ghent), was a missionary among the Frisians and Saxons during the first years of the reign of Charlemagne. He was an Anglo-Saxon by birth, but left his English home, and offered his services to Gregory of Utrecht. Gregory sent him, together with Marchelm, or Marcellin, into Friesland, where he built two churches, — one in Wulpfen, on the western shore of the Yssel, and another in Deventer, on the eastern. He also penetrated into the land of the Saxons. The church of Deventer was twice burned down, the last time, as it seems, by the Saxons (778). Labein is the patron saint of Deventer, and he is commemorated on Nov. 12 or July 25. See Surius: Vite Sanctorum, vi. 277; and Marillon: Acta Sanctorum, v. 21 and 80.

LECENE, Charles, b. at Caen, 1647; d. in
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London, 1708. He studied at Sedan, Geneva, and Saumur, and was appointed pastor of Honfleur, 1672, and of Charenton, 1682, but was denounced as a Pelagian before the consistory. After the revolution of the Edict of Nantes, he retired into Holland, and afterwards to London. He wrote, besides some theological treatises, "De l'emploi du surnom de la Bible" (Rotterdam, 1696); and after his death his translation of the Bible was published by his son (Amsterdam, 1741). "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness," he translates, "Faisons hommes sur le dessin et sur l'idée que nous en avons formé, and "the sons of God" (Job 1:6), personnes de qualité, and so throughout the version is bizarre and inexact, poor in style, and paraphrastic rather than literal. The synod of Brille (1742) condemned the translation.

LE CLERC, Jean. See Clericus.

LECTERN, or LECTURN, the reading-desk in the choir of a church. The commonest form at present is that of an eagle with outstretched wings. They are commonly made of brass, though primarily of wood. In Scotland, a generation ago, the preacher's desk was so named; but the word was pronounced lettern.

LECTIONARIES. In its liturgical sense, lection (λόγισμα, or λόγίσμων) denotes the reading, which, besides singing, prayers, preaching, and the administration of the sacraments, forms part of the divine service. The custom dates back to the first days of the Church (Justin: Apol., 1:57; Tertullian: Apol. 56), and was borrowed from the synagogue. In the oldest time the lessons were, of course, taken from the Old Testament alone, afterwards also from the New Testament.

At one time it was quite common to use sermons by celebrated preachers; the Acta Martyrum and other writings not belonging to the canon (as shown both by the very existence of the so-called Libri ecclesiastici, that is, uncanonical books used in divine service, and by the decrees of several councils, Laodicea, 360, can. 59; Hippo, 393, can. 38; Carthage, 397, etc.) forbidding the use of such books. The number of lessons varied. The Greek Church of that time had three, that is, before the introduction of the Roman ritual, had three lessons, and so had the Spanish, — one from the Old Testament, one from the Gospels, and one from the Epistles. The Greek and Roman churches, which the Lutheran and Anglican churches follow, have only two lessons, of which the second is always taken from the Gospels, while the first may be taken from the Epistles, the Acts, or the Old Testament. Originally the lessons were continuous (lectio continua); that is, one began where the other had stopped. But soon it became customary to appoint certain lessons for certain days (as, for instance, the narrative of the resurrection for Easter Day); and from this custom gradually developed a complete system of lessons for the whole ecclesiastical year. (See the art. PERICOP.) Such a list of lessons was called Lectionaria (ac. volumina), or Lectures (ac. lectoris), or Lectures (ac. scriptorum). The oldest Lectionaria are the so-called Comes, which, however, is not the work of Jerome (see Opp. Hieron., ed. Vallars., xi. p. 528), the Lectionarium Gallicanum (discovered by Maubillon in the monastery of Luxeuil, and edited in his De liturg. Gall.) Lectionarium Romanum (found in the Calendarium Romanum, ed. Florou, Paris, 1852), and Lectionarium Alamunicum, edited by Gerbert, in Monum. vetera liturgiae Alaman, 1777.


F. Nitzsch.

LECTOR (λόγιστος), an officer of the ancient Church, whose duty it was to read the lessons in the divine service, and to keep the sacred books. At what time this part of the public service became connected with a special office is uncertain; but Tertullian and Cyprian speak of the lector as a regular church officer, and of his ordination as a grave and solemn ceremony. As his duty, however, consisted in the merely mechanical reading of the lessons, without any exegetical or homiletical exposition, his office belonged to the lower clerical orders, and gradually disappeared altogether. In the fifth century the deacon was charged with the reading of the Gospels, and, later on, the subdeacon, with that of the Epistles. At present the Church of Rome has no lectors at all, and the ordination as lector is only a preparation to the priestly ordination. See J. A. Schmidt: De primitiva ecclesia lectoribus, Helmstädt, 1896.

F. Nitzsch.

LECTURES, LECTURE COURSES. See Bampton, Boyle, Hulsean, etc., and Appendix.

LEE, Ann, foundress of the sect of Shakers in America; b. in Manchester, Eng., Feb. 28, 1730; d. at Watervliet, N.Y., Sept. 8, 1784. Her father was a blacksmith, and she received no education, but was sent to work in a cotton-factory; afterwards, was a cook in the Manchester Infirmary; and then, while yet young, married Abraham Standley, a blacksmith and sixth century, and she died in infancy. In 1758 she joined the Manchester society of Friends, who were called the "Shaking Quakers," and were headed by James Wardley. Being naturally excitable, she was quickly affected by the so-called "religious exercises" of the society, and began to prophesy, to make revelations. But it was not until 1770 that she had the epoch-making revelation against marriage, and began her "testimony against all lustful gratifications as the source and foundation of human corruption and misery." Her course led to her imprisonment in Manchester. It was feared that Christ appeared to her in a vision, and revealed to her that she was the second incarnation of Christ, and thus the head of all women, as he was the head of all men. From that time forth, she has been called by her followers, "Mother Ann," and believed with reference to her, that she separated herself from her husband. Henceforth she claimed to be directed by revelations and visions. In 1774 she came with her followers to America, and finally settled, in the spring of 1778, at Watervliet, near Albany, N.Y. During
LEGATES.

Lee, Jesse, "the apostle of Methodism in New England;" b. in Prince George County, Va., March 12, 1758; d. in Baltimore, Md., Sept. 12, 1816. He was received into the conference, 1783. After three years' labor in North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, and New Jersey, he was sent to New England, where, in Stratfield, Conn., Sept. 26, 1787, he formed the first Methodist "class" (consisting of three women); and the first in Boston, Mass., July 13, 1792 (his first sermon there was preached on the Common, July 9, 1790). In 1796 he became assistant to Asbury. After 1800 he returned to the South, leaving behind him in New England fifty Methodist preachers and six thousand members, as the fruit of his toil. In 1807, 1812, and 1818, he was chaplain of the United-States House of Representatives, and from 1814 until his death, chaplain of the United-States Senate. He was a fearless, plain, and successful preacher. As an organizer and founder, he ranks next to Asbury. In the field of denominational reform, in which he was greatly interested, he distinguished himself by suggesting, in 1792, the delegated general conference of the Methodist Church; but the idea was not carried out until 1808. He published a valuable History of Methodism in America, Baltimore, 1807. See LEROY M. LEE: Life and Times of Jesse Lee, Richmond, Va., 1845.

Lee, Samuel, D.D., Orientalist, b. at Longnor, Shropshire, England, Sept. 14, 1756; d. in Somersetshire, Dec. 16, 1852. The rudiments of his education were received at a charity school; but he was apprenticed to a carpenter at the age of twelve. While working at his trade, he studied especially languages; and before he was twenty-five he had acquired, without a teacher, Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Chaldean, Samaritan, and Syriac, to which he subsequently added Arabic, Persian, Hindustanee, French, and German. In 1810 he became master of Bowdler's School, Shrewsbury. In 1813 he entered Queen's College, Cambridge; took his degree of B.A., 1817; entered the ministry; was made professor of Arabic in his university, 1819, and regius professor of Hebrew, 1831; at his death he was also rector of Barley. He received the degree of D.D. from Hall in 1822, and from Cambridge, 1833. His publications evince learning and ability of a high order. The chief are, Prolegomena in Biblica Polyglot; Lexicon, Hebrew, Chaldee, and English (1840); Authorities, principally from Oriental Sources (1850, new ed., 1844); The Book of the Patriarch Job translated, with Introduction and Commentary (1837); A Lexicon, Hebrew, Chaldean, and English (1840).
the secular governments complained, and in many special cases compelled the Pope to make concessions on the institution of the army. But there were some slight changes during the reign of Leo X. But of much greater importance were the alterations which resulted from the German Reformation. By the peace of Augsburg (1555) the German Empire declared that its army should not be used for the suppression of Protestantism. In Western Germany, however, as also in the Spanish Netherlands, there were evangelical territories in which the Roman-Catholic bishops and archbishops could not be maintained. In order not to abandon those territories altogether, it became necessary to establish fixed nunciatures. Such fixed nunciatures already existed, one in Vienna, and another in Warsaw, but both those nunciatures were of political origin and of predominantly political character. The new ones—established at Cologne, 1552, Lucern, 1566, and Brussels, 1600—had the primary object to do missionary work in the evangelical territories. It soon became apparent, however, that the institution was unable to work in union with the episcopacy; and great troubles ensued. See the art. EMS, CONGRESS OF.

LEGEND. In medieval language Legenda, or Legendarii (ac. libri) denotes such collections of extracts from the lives of saints and martyrs as were authorized to be used as lessons in divine service on their memorial days. A more exact expression distinguishes between Passionarii and Legendarii, referring the former specially to the martyrs, and the latter to the saints in general. The custom, however, of reading the lives of martyrs and saints in the divine service on their memorial days is much older than the medieval name indicates. The thirty-sixth canon of the synod of Hippo (393) allows the passions of the martyrs to be read on their anniversaries; and from Augustine's sermons (Nos. 278 and 315) it appears, that at his time, the custom was general in the North African churches. The Lectionarium Gallicanum contains lessons from the Acta Martyrum, and Avitus of Vienne states that the passion of the holy martyrs of Agnnium was read ex conventibus dieibus. The Gelasian decree, De libris recipiendis, forbade the use of the Acta Martyrum as lessons, because their authors were unknown; but Adrian I. again allowed it.

The liturgical use, however, which was made of the legends, by no means exhausts their theological significance. They originated without reference to liturgy: they would also have developed without connection with it. A congregation could never fail to take an interest in its own saints and martyrs, nor could it ever fail to find edification in the reading of their lives. Thus legends became a literature. In the first century this literature had a historical character. Legends form a historical source, though a source which must be used with caution. The Acta Martyrum and Acta Sanctorum (following the Calendaria, Dingliana, and Martyrium), the Vita Matrum and Passionalia of the old Church, were not mere story-books. Eusebius' book on the martyrs of Palestine, Palladius' Historia Lausiaca, even Theodoret's Historia syriaca, and J. Moschus' Historia ecclesiastica, contained true historical information, as well as the De Virtu Illustris by Jerome, Collectanea Patrum by Cassianus, Vita Patrum by Gregory of Tours, etc.

But there came a time, about the ninth century, when a regard to edification, an inclination towards fantasticalness, and even less excusable motives, got the better of the historical sense, and transformed the legends into a maze of fiction. This tendency is represented in the Greek Church by the lives of the Saints, by Simeon Metaphrastes, and in the Latin Church by the Legenda Aurea of Jacobus a Voragine. The exaggerations, however, and, in many cases, the frauds, were so palpable, that no amount of credulity was sufficient to bear them for a long time. Even in the fifteenth century the historical conscience stirred up Monnibritius; and in the seventeenth century the whole mass of legendary matter was subjected to an often very acute criticism by the Bollandists. In the eighteenth century, on the instance of Herder, the legends were once more taken up, but from a merely literary point of view. See MAURY: Les Legendes pieuses du Moyen Age, Paris, 1813; HORSTMANN: Alteilgische Legenden, Paderborn, 1875.

LEGENDARY THEORY. See MYTHICAL.

LEGER, Jean, b. at Villa Sana, in Piedmont, Feb. 2, 1615; studied at Geneva; was appointed pastor of the churches of Prali and Rodoretto in 1639, and in 1643 of the Church of St. Giovanni among the Waldenses; fled in 1655, on account of the barbarous persecutions instituted by the Duke of Savoy, and sought aid for his flock from Louis XIV. and Cromwell, on whose recommendation the Palatines de grâce were granted, but became afterwards the subject of a special persecution; fled once more, and found rescue at Leyden. The exact date of his death is unknown. His Histoire générale des Églises evangéliques du Piémont, one of the principal sources of information concerning the Waldenses, appeared at Leyden, 1689, 2 vols.

LEQIO FULMINATRIX. See LEQIO, THUNDERING.

LEQIO, The Theban. According to the legend,—such it occurs, in its oldest and simplest form, in the Passio ascribed to Bishop Eucherius of Lyons,—a legion consisting of sixty-six hundred men, and called the "Theban," was sent from the Orient to Northern Italy to re-enforce the army of Maximin. He intended to use his army to persecute the Christians; but the soldiers of the Theban Legion, being Christians themselves, refused to obey his orders. Exasperated at the refusal, he had the legion twice decimated; and as the soldiers, exhorted by their commander Mauritius, continued firm, he had the whole legion massacred. In later versions this legend appears much extended, and adorned with many more or less fabulous features.

The Magdeburg Centuries declared Mauritius, though he is the patron saint of Magdeburg, an idol, and the whole legend a fiction. Its untenableness was still more elaborately demonstrated by J. A. du Bordien (Dissertation critique sur l'histoire de la légion Thébaine, Amsterdam, 1705) and Hottinger (Helvetische Kirchengeschichte, Zürich, 1708). On the other hand, its historicalism was defended by De l'Isle, canon of St. Maurice (Défense de la vérité de la légion Théb., Nancy, 1741), by the Bollandists (who gave a very
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in Hanover between the Prussian court-preacher, Jabolow, on the one side, and Molanus and Leibnitz on the other. A Collegium iranense was established in Berlin 1703; but the only result of the negotiations seems to have been the term "evangelical" as the common designation of the different Reformed churches, in contradistinction to the Church of Rome.

LIT. — The philosophical works of Leibnitz have been edited by EHRMANN (Berlin, 1839–40), JACOBS (Paris, 1842), JANET (Paris, 1856). Complete editions have been published by PERTZ (Hanover, 1843) and FOUCHER DE CARREL (Paris, 1860). His German works were edited by GUNKNER (Berlin, 1839–40), who also wrote his Life (Breslau, 1842, 2 vols). See also Class: D. metaphysischen Vorarbeiten des Leibnitz. Determinismus, 1874; TICHLER: Die Theologie des Leibnitz, 1889.

R. ECKEN.

LEIGHTON, Robert, successively minister of Newbattle, principal of the university of Edinburgh, bishop of Dunblane, and archbishop of Glasgow; b. at Shawford, Leicestershire, March 24, 1609; d. in Middlesex, June 2, 1671. He proceeded M.A. at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, 1623, and entered the Middle Temple. In 1636 he sat in Parliament as member for Stafford, and was expelled with his brother Presbyterians in 1648. He gave much attention to theology and biblical studies, and published several useful works, among which may be mentioned Critica sacra, containing Observations on all the Radices of the Hebrew Words of the Old, and the Greek of the New Testament, London, 1636, 4th and best edition, 1662, Latin translation, Amsterdam, 1696 (formerly much used, now supplanted); A Body of Divinity in Ten Books, 1654; Treatise of Religion and Learning, and of Religious and Learned Men, 1656; and a compilation, Annotations upon the New Testament, 1650 (Latin translation, Leipzig, 1792).

LEIGHTON, Edward. Puritan writer; b. at Shawford, Leicestershire, March 24, 1609; d. in Middlesex, June 2, 1671. He proceeded M.A. at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, 1623, and entered the Middle Temple. In 1636 he sat in Parliament as member for Stafford, and was expelled with his brother Presbyterians in 1648. He gave much attention to theology and biblical studies, and published several useful works, among which may be mentioned Critica sacra, containing Observations on all the Radices of the Hebrew Words of the Old, and the Greek of the New Testament, London, 1636, 4th and best edition, 1662, Latin translation, Amsterdam, 1696 (formerly much used, now supplanted); A Body of Divinity in Ten Books, 1654; Treatise of Religion and Learning, and of Religious and Learned Men, 1656; and a compilation, Annotations upon the New Testament, 1650 (Latin translation, Leipzig, 1792).

LEIGHTON, Robert, successively minister of Newbattle, principal of the university of Edinburgh, bishop of Dunblane, and archbishop of Glasgow; b. at Shawford, Leicestershire, March 24, 1609; d. in Middlesex, June 2, 1671. He proceeded M.A. at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, 1623, and entered the Middle Temple. In 1636 he sat in Parliament as member for Stafford, and was expelled with his brother Presbyterians in 1648. He gave much attention to theology and biblical studies, and published several useful works, among which may be mentioned Critica sacra, containing Observations on all the Radices of the Hebrew Words of the Old, and the Greek of the New Testament, London, 1636, 4th and best edition, 1662, Latin translation, Amsterdam, 1696 (formerly much used, now supplanted); A Body of Divinity in Ten Books, 1654; Treatise of Religion and Learning, and of Religious and Learned Men, 1656; and a compilation, Annotations upon the New Testament, 1650 (Latin translation, Leipzig, 1792).

On Dec. 16, 1652, he offered to demit his charge, and the presbytery refused to accept of the demisition. The reasons Leighton gave for his request were "the greatness of the congregation far exceeding his strength for discharging the duties thereof, especially the extreme weakness of his voice, not being able to reach the half of them when they are convened, which had long pressed him very sore, which he formerly had often expressed to us [the presbytery]." But in January, 1658, the town council of Edinburgh having elected him to be principal of his college there, the presbytery, on the 3d of February, "transport-
ed him to that charge." Leighton held this high
office till the Restoration.
As principal and primarius professor of divinity
he gave a lecture in theology to the students
once a week, and preached in the college church
every third sabbath. His Praeludia, Hymnologiae,
along with his Paramesea and Meditationes ethico-
critica in Psalms, written in Latin of Ciceronian
purity, were read in the college, and are given
with his published works. According to Dr.
Tulloch, "they are the most interesting of his
works;" though that which has chiefly endeared
him to earnest Christians is his Commentary on
the First Epistle of Peter. Of his writings,
Bishop Jebb has said, "his commentary is a
 treasury of devotion; his theological lectures are
the very philosophy of the New Testament; and
his meditations on some of the psalms raise us
to those purer and sublimier heights where it was
his delight and privilege habitually to dwell."
All were composed while he was a minister or
professor in the Covenanting Church; and that
he was able to continue in it till it was over-
town, while it was allowed, or felt constrained,
to resign its place in that form, is the
best proof, that, with all superficial differ-
ences there were deeper and more essentialhar
monies between him and the best of his Puritan
contemporaries than have been yet acknowledged.
Many of his finest gems have a genuine Puritan
RING.
He succeeded in obtaining from Cromwell's gov-
ernment a better revenue for the university; and,
in order to elevate academical training, he recom-
manded, as Knox had done, the establishment of
grammar-schools in various parts of Scotland. In
the recess of the college session he made visits to
the Continent, and kept up correspondence with
some of the Jansenists, which gave rise to a sus-
picion of his becoming a Catholic, and probably,
along with the contentions of his time, developed
that quietism, and indifference to externals, which
prepared the way for a change in his ecclesiasti-
cal relations. This change occurred in 1661, on
the establishment of episcopacy in Scotland. He
decided to remain in the reconstituted church,
became bishop of Dunblane, and was consecrated
to that see, along with Sharp and other two, in
Westminster Abbey, Dec. 15, 1661.
It was an immense gain to the new order to
have a bishop with the endowments, learning,
eminent piety of Leighton, in their ranks.
The purity and sincerity of his motives in mak-
ing the transition are above all question. Dr.
Flint has said, "A purer, humbler, holier spirit
than that of Robert Leighton never cabernacled
in Scottish clay;" and he might have added, "nor
in any other clay." "He was accounted a saint
from his youth," and his days were "linked each to
each by natural piety." That gentle, loving, and
devout student, as he comes before us in his let-
ters to his parents, gradually increased in learn-
ing, in culture, in spiritual insight and practical
development, till he became the "angelic man" whom
Burnet so lovingly portrayed, — "that true Father
of the Church of Christ," whose noble thoughts
Coleridge has delighted to unfold. He was, as
Bishop Jebb says, "a human seraph, uniting the
solar warmth with the solar light, unde arret unde
lucet." He was, in fact, the Scottish Hooker and
Howe in one, and "will not suffer by comparison
with any divine in any age." Even Scotchmen,
who thank God for the noble men who "preached
to the times," and sacrificed life and all they held
dear to carry on the struggle in which Leighton's
father suffered so cruelly, will not fail to think
God that there was one noble man in those un-
quiet days who kept so much apart from the
strife of tongues, fixed his gaze so steadily be-
yond passing controversies, preached and lived
for eternity, and whose voice is still a continual
reminder that . . . the celestial mountains are
before us, and thither lies our true destiny."
Very soon after his alliance with Sharp he be-
gan to discover how hard a task he had under-
taken; and, as Burnet says, "he quickly lost all
heart and hope, observing such cross characters
of an angry Providence as seemed to say that
God was against them." He entered his see in
1662, and discharged its duties in a loving and
tender spirit till 1672. His diocese consisted of
the two presbyteries of Dunblane and Auchter-
arder, comprising more than thirty parishes in the
western part of Perthshire. These presbyteries
continued their meetings as before; and the
synod over which Leighton presided, as its rec-
ords published by Dr. John Wilson in 1877 fully
show, met twice a year, and each member had
"full liberty of voting, and debating their assent
dissent, as ever they had in former times."
There were only three or four nonconformist
ministers. The ritual of the church was un-
changed, neither liturgy nor surplice being used.
Externally the frame-work was the same, but a
new motive-power had been introduced into the
machinery. As Sharp's and other bishops' views
were not in accordance with his, Leighton's modi-
fi ed episcopacy, and the spirit of conciliation he
tried to infuse into the councils of the king and
his ministers, were thwarted. Leighton, both in
Parliament and in presence of Charles II., plead-
ed for milder measures, and got the "indul-
gence." Archbishop Burnet of Glasgow, having
opposed this clemency, was superseded, and Leig-
ton was appointed commendator of Glasgow in
1670, and archbishop of Glasgow in 1672. In
the wider sphere in which he was thus placed, he
launched a scheme of "Accommodation," so as to
bridge over the gulf that yawned between the
Presbyterians and Episcopalians; and along with
Dr. Gilbert Burnet, then professor of divinity in
Glasgow University, and afterwards bishop of
Salisbury, he labored hard to gain his object.
The bridge broke down. He was disheartened
with the remorseless measures of the government
against the Covenanters, and the stern resolution
of the anti-prelatists to admit of no surrender.
He accordingly went to London, and tendered his
resignation, as, indeed, he had done more than
once when in Dunblane. Charles II. persuaded
him to continue one year longer; and he was
permitted to retire in September, 1674. For a
short time he lived within the college of Edin-
burgh, and afterwards found a home of peace
under the roof-tree of his sister, Mrs. Lightmaker,
at Broadhurst in Sussex. In 1679 he was invited
by the king to go down to Scotland, after Sharp's
assassination, to pour oil on the troubled waves;
but he remained in his loved retreat. He went up
to London to meet the Earl of Perth in 1684; and
Burnet, who met him, congratulated him on his healthy looks. He in reply stated "that he was near his end, and his journey almost done." Next day he was seized with pleurisy, and in two days more, on the 26th of June, 1684, died at the Bell Inn, Warwick Lane, thus realizing a fond wish of his life, that, like a pilgrim, he might die in an inn. He was buried in the south chancel of the Church of Horsted Keynes, Sussex, the parish in which he had resided for some years. He requested his library to the diocese of Dunblane, where it still continues. His works consist of Sermons and Charges to the Clergy, Preface to Theology and Paremesees, and Commentary on the First Epistle of Peter. Coleridge has based his work, Aids to Reflection, on some of the choicest pieces of Leighton's rich mind, and has brought them as tune into favor among the cultured as they had long been among humble, earnest Christians.

Lit. — Leighton is said to have published nothing during his lifetime, and before his death to have signified to his relatives his wish that his papers should be destroyed; but a list of all his works, and which may be said to constitute the editio princeps of his works, were published with the sanction of these relatives, and edited by Dr. James Fall, principal of Glasgow University before the Revolution, and afterwards canon of York. Their titles are, (1) Sermons Preached by Dr. Robert Leighton, late Archbishop of Glasgow. Published, at the desire of his friends, after his death, from his papers, written with his own hand, etc. London, 1692, 8vo. (2) A Practical Commentary upon the Two First Chapters of the First Epistle General of St. Peter, by the Most Rev. Dr. Robert Leighton, sometime Archbishop of Glasgow. Published at the desire of his friends, after his death, from his papers, written with his own hand, etc. London, 1692, 8vo. (3) A Practical Commentary upon the First Epistle General of St. Peter. Part ii., London, 1684. The principal subsequent editions are those of J. Wilson (Edinburgh, 1748-63), of Middleton (London, c. 1750), of Foster (London, 1777), of Jerment (London, 1808 and 1814), of Baynes (London, 1828 and 1829), of Pearson (London, 1825, and again in 1855), and, above all, that begun in 1850, and still proceeding with such learned pains and loving care, but yet with such a strong high-Church bias, by the Rev. W. West, B.A., and published by the Longmans, London. The volume which is to contain the life and letters of the archbishop is expected to be published soon, and it cannot fail to meet much favor, if not always quite uncolored, light on his history and that of his father. In Wilson's edition (vol. i.) we have the first attempt at a biography, and also a preface by Dr. Doddridge. The former was appropriated by Middleton, and the latter by most subsequent editors. The life by Jerment is a decided advance on Wilson's; and Pearson's, no less decided advance on his.

The following are the other materials for illustrating his biography: Life of Archbishop Leighton, Edinburgh [n.d. by Dr. Thomas Murray]; the same in IRVING'S Lives of Scottish Writers, Edinburgh, 1828; (2) MANNING, in The Wisdom of our Fathers, Tract Society, London; Life of Archbishop Leighton, with Brief Extracts from his Writings, New York, 1840; Extracts from the Presbytery Records of Dalkeith, relating to the Parish of Newbattle during the incumbency of Mr. Robert Leighton, 1641-1658. Communicated by the Rev. Thomas Gordon, Minister of Newbattle. With some Introductory Remarks by David Laing, Esq., V.P., of the Society of Antiquaries, Edinburgh. Printed in Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, 1862, pp. 459-489, and substance of them embodied in letter to editor of Notes and Queries (vol. i., 1862, pp. 441-445). Several letters of Leighton, recovered from State-paper office, or drawn from the Lauderdale correspondence now in the British Museum, will be found in same volume of Notes and Queries, pp. 106, 121, 143, 165, 244. Three papers entitled Archbishop Leighton are to be found in The United Free Press of the Journal of Scottish Theology, 1865, pp. 387, 493, and 1866, p. 15, by the present writer; also Four papers in the same serial by the same writer, 1869, entitled The Bishop of Dunblane, pp. 304, 355, 400, 448; Two papers, by the writer of this article, in the British and Foreign Evangelical Review, December 1869, and January 1870, entitled A Scottish Presbytery of the Seventeenth Century, p. 22; the second, Scottish Prelacy after the Restoration, p. 381; — Register of the Diocesan Synod of Dunblane (1682-88), with an Introduction and Biographical Notes, by John Wilson, D.D., clerk to the synod of Perth and Stirling, Edinburgh, 1877, 4to; An Account of the Foundation of the Leightonian Library, by Robert Douglas, bishop of Dunblane [with introduction by D. Laing, Esq., and notes, etc.], in the third volume of The Bannatyne Miscellany, printed at Edinburgh, 1884 (pp. 226-272), 4to; Robert Leighton; or, the Peacefulness of Faith, from Lights of the World, or Illustrations of Character drawn from the Records of Christian Life, by the Rev. JOHN STOUTED, D.D., London, Religious Tract Society, pp. 57-60, n.d.; — Aids to Reflection, by SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE, London, 1824; Scotichronicon, vol. i, by F. S. Gordon, D.D., Glasgow, 1870; articles in various encyclopedias and biographical dictionaries. The writer of this notice issued in London, 1884, selections from the writings of Archbishop Leighton, with a life of the author. W. BLAIR, D.D. (of Dunblane).
each of the princes, and one for the faculty of Leipzig; but general reports were soon after published in Germany, Holland, France, and England. The protocol may be found printed in Leipzig, 1831; Hering: Gesch. d. kirchlichen Unterrichts in Deutschland, 1834.

LEIPZIG INTERIM. See Eck, Carlstadt, Luther.

LEIPZIG DISPUTATION. See Eck, Carlstadt, Luther.

LEIPZIG DISPUTATION. See Eck, Carlstadt, Luther.

LELAND, John, b. at Wigan, Lancashire, Oct. 15, 1539; d. in Dublin, Ireland, Jan. 16, 1706. He was educated at the University of Dublin, and from 1716 to his death was pastor of a Presbyterian church in that city. He wrote in 1733 A Defence of Christianity, in reply to Tindal's Christianity as Old as the Creation; in 1738, The Divine Authority of the Old and New Testaments asserted, in reply to Morgan's Moral Philosopher; and in 1706, The Advancement and Necessity of the Christian Religion. After his death, his Discourses on Various Subjects (1768-69, 4 vols.) was published, with his life. All these works are now forgotten. But one of his books still lives, A View of the Principal Deistical Writers that have appeared in England in the Last and Present Century, London, 1754-56, 2 vols.; best edition, London, 1837, 1 vol. This work is valuable for its industrious collection of facts about the deistic writers, but its arguments are not adapted for present use.

LELONG, Jacques, b. in Paris, April 19, 1665; d. there Aug. 17, 1721. He entered the Congregation of the Oratory in 1686; and was in 1699 appointed librarian at the Oratoire St. Honoré in Paris. His principal work is his Bibliotheque Sacra, (Paris, 1709), of which enlarged editions were published by C. F. Bornier, Leipzig, 1769, and by A. G. Masch, Halle, 1778-90. He also published Discours historiques sur les principales editions des Bibles Polyglottes (1713), Supplement à l'Histoire des dictionnaires Hebraux de Wolfius, 1707; and Nouvelle méthode des langues Hebraique et Chaldéenne, 1741.

LE MAITRE, Louis Isaac, better known under the name of BACY, b. in Paris, March 29, 1613; d. at Pomponne, Jan. 4, 1684. After studying theology, he entered the service of the Church; was ordained a priest in 1646; and was appointed preacher to the French congregation at Heidelberg, 1684, and at Berlin, 1688. He was a prolific writer, especially on church history. His principal work, Preservatif contre la réunion de la Sainte-Church, Amsterdam, 1714; Hist. du Concile de Trent, Amsterdam, 1721; Hist. de la papesse Jeanne, etc. He translated the New Testament, and wrote a commentary to it. Noticeable is also his polemical work, Préservatif contre la réunion avec le Siège de Rome, 1723.

LENOIR, Louis. See Christ, Pictures of.

LEO is the name of thirteen Popes; namely, Leo I., the Great (440-461). Veritable history of his earlier life; though, for some years previous to his election, he occupied a prominent position in Rome. It was to him that Cyril of Alexandria, in his controversy with Juvenal of Jerusalem, addressed himself in 431; and in the moment of his election he was absent in Gaul, sent thither by the emperor as mediator between Attilius and Albinus. Singularly enough, also, his death is uncertain; the date varying between April 11, June 28, Oct. 30, and Nov. 10: while otherwise his reign stands out in full light, both with respect to its general bearing, and with respect to its details. It denotes the foundation of the Council of Chalcedon. Leo I. is the true inventor of the theory of an ecclesiastical monarchy under the headship of the Pope. The two propositions on which that whole
theory hangs — the primacy of Peter among the apostles, on account of which the others are subject to his supreme authority (Serm., iv. 2); and the transference of that primacy to his successors, the bishops of Rome, on account of which Peter himself speaks whenever a Pope speaks (Serm., iii. 2) — found, both for the first time, their full and exhaustive exposition in the sermons and letters of Leo I.; and he added (Ep. 10), to revolt against this primacy is to precipitate one's self into hell.

His success in carrying out his theory into practice was various. In proconsular Africa the Christian Church had, to a large extent, lost its importance. Only Mauritania Cæsariensis still belonged to the empire, and remained true to the Confession of Nicaea. But that insulated remnant of the orthodox Church in Africa needed support from without, and was consequently easily made subject to the authority of the supporter. Leo sent Bishop Polentius theretofore to investigate the state of affairs; and when Polentius reported, that, through intrigues and riots, many unworthy persons had been installed into the first offices of the Church, there followed a very severe rebuke from the Pope. Appeals to Rome, which, a decade before, had been absolutely forbidden by an African synod, were now regularly instituted, and the Pope demanded that all synodal decisions should be sent to Rome for confirmation (Ep. 12). More complicated proved the affairs of Illyria and Gaul. In Illyria the contest was standing between the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Bishop of Rome. Innocent I. had conferred a kind of apostolical vicariate on the metropolitans of Thessalonica; but the Illyrian bishops continued, nevertheless, to be drawn towards Constantinople, as if by a natural force. Leo I. conferred the vicariate on the metropolitan Anastasius (Ep. 6), and was in the beginning very much pleased with his behavior (Ep. 13), but found occasion afterwards to administer some sharp rebukes (Ep. 15). The issue, however, of the affair was not known. In Gaul, Pope Zosimus had conferred the primacy on Bishop Patroclus of Anvers; and on which point the synod of 445 restored Celidonius, and the latter an equal power, placing Asia, Pontus, and Thrace under his jurisdiction. When the canon of 449 was, however, one of those canons (c. 28) which the orthodox Church rallyed so much the more closely around him. A synod of Rome of the same year rejected all the canons of the synod of Ephesus, which it characterized as a "carnival of the peculiar position of the Gallican Church, the weakness of the Roman power, the establishment of Arian kingdoms in the country, and the general confusion caused by the intermittent invasion of barbarous nations, such a measure of centralization seemed quite expedient. But the successor of Patroclus, Hilaris, came into conflict with Celidonius, metropolitan of Besançon; and, when Celidonius was deposed by a Gallican synod, he appealed to the Pope, and repaired to Rome. Hilarus also went to Rome, but fled in haste from the city, fearing the worst. It was, indeed, the policy of the Roman bishops to favor the appellant, in order to encourage appeals; and this policy was followed also in the present case. A Roman synod of 445 restored Celidonius, and strictly confined the power of Hilarus to his own diocese; and, in order to secure the enforcement of these decisions, Leo I. sought and obtained the support of the secular government. June 6, 445, Valentinian III. issued the famous law, which, from regard to the merits of the apostle Peter, the dignity of the city of Rome, and the decisions of the Council of Nicaea (the spurious sixth canon), recognized the Bishop of Rome as the head of the Christian Church, binding all the ordinances as general laws, defined opposition to them as a kind of crimine læse majestatis, and ordered all secular authorities to arrest and surrender any person, who, summoned by the Pope, neglected to appear. Less effective was his interference in the affairs of the Church of Alexandria. In the fourth year he accused that church (Ep. 9) concerning certain ritual and liturgical differences. The Church of Rome, he argues, is built exclusively on Peter, the prince of the apostles; but how is it possible that his disciple Mark should have deviated from his master in founding the Alexandrian Church? The Alexandrian Church, however, seems to have had too lofty a self-consciousness to heed the anxious questions of the Pope.

The most brilliant part of the reign of Leo I. is his relation to the Eastern Church and the christological controversy then taking place there. Eutyches first addressed him, complaining of the reappearance of Nestorianism; and after his condemnation by Flavian, patriarch of Constantinople, he wholly threw himself upon Leo, protesting his willingness to acquiesce in any decision he might make in the case. As the entreaties of Eutyches were supported by the Emperor Theodosius, Leo was at once drawn into the very midst of the controversy; and, as was natural, he at first assumed a very cold attitude towards Flavian. Nevertheless, after receiving the acts of the synod which had condemned Eutyches, together with all other materials pertinent, he confirmed the condemnation, and accompanied the confirmation with a positive exposition of the doctrine of the two natures united in Christ, — the celebrated Letter to Flavian of June 13, 449 (Ep. 28). In consequence, the synod of Ephesus (449) excommunicated him; but the only result of the excommunication was, that the ill-used and maltreated minority of the Eastern Church rallied so much the more closely around him. A synod of Rome of the same year rejected all the canons of the synod of Ephesus, which it characterized as a "carnival of the peculiar position of the Gallican Church, the weakness of the Roman power, the establishment of Arian kingdoms in the country, and the general confusion caused by the intermittent invasion of barbarous nations, such a measure of centralization seemed quite expedient. But the successor of Patroclus, Hilaris, came into conflict with Celidonius, metropolitan of Besançon; and, when Celidonius was deposed by a Gallican synod, he appealed to the Pope, and repaired to Rome. Hilarus also went to Rome, but fled in haste from the city, fearing the worst. It was, indeed, the policy of the Roman bishops to favor the appellant, in order to encourage appeals; and this policy was followed also in the present case. A Roman synod of 445 restored Celidonius, and strictly confined the power of Hilarus to his own diocese; and, in order to secure the enforcement of these decisions, Leo I. sought and obtained the support of the secular government. June 6, 445, Valentinian III. issued the famous law, which, from regard to the merits of the apostle Peter, the dignity of the city of Rome, and the decisions of the Council of Nicaea (the spurious sixth canon), recognized the Bishop of Rome as the head of the Christian Church, binding all the ordinances as general laws, defined opposition to them as a kind of crimine læse majestatis, and ordered all secular authorities to arrest and surrender any person, who, summoned by the Pope, neglected to appear. Less effective was his interference in the affairs of the Church of Alexandria. In the fourth year he accused that church (Ep. 9) concerning certain ritual and liturgical differences. The Church of Rome, he argues, is built exclusively on Peter, the prince of the apostles; but how is it possible that his disciple Mark should have deviated from his master in founding the Alexandrian Church? The Alexandrian Church, however, seems to have had too lofty a self-consciousness to heed the anxious questions of the Pope.

The most brilliant part of the reign of Leo I. is his relation to the Eastern Church and the christological controversy then taking place there. Eutyches first addressed him, complaining of the reappearance of Nestorianism; and after his condemnation by Flavian, patriarch of Constantinople, he wholly threw himself upon Leo, protesting his willingness to acquiesce in any decision he might make in the case. As the entreaties of Eutyches were supported by the Emperor Theodosius, Leo was at once drawn into the very midst of the controversy; and, as was natural, he at first assumed a very cold attitude towards Flavian. Nevertheless, after receiving the acts of the synod which had condemned Eutyches, together with all other materials pertinent, he confirmed the condemnation, and accompanied the confirmation with a positive exposition of the doctrine of the two natures united in Christ, — the celebrated Letter to Flavian of June 13, 449 (Ep. 28). In consequence, the synod of Ephesus (449) excommunicated him; but the only result of the excommunication was, that the ill-used and maltreated minority of the Eastern Church rallied so much the more closely around him. A synod of Rome of the same year rejected all the canons of the synod of Ephesus, which it characterized as a "carnival of the peculiar position of the Gallican Church, the weakness of the Roman power, the establishment of Arian kingdoms in the country, and the general confusion caused by the intermittent invasion of barbarous nations, such a measure of centralization seemed quite expedient. But the successor of Patroclus, Hilaris, came into conflict with Celidonius, metropolitan of Besançon; and, when Celidonius was deposed by a Gallican synod, he appealed to the Pope, and repaired to Rome. Hilarus also went to Rome, but fled in haste from the city, fearing the worst. It was, indeed, the policy of the Roman bishops to favor the appellant, in order to encourage appeals; and this policy was followed also in the present case. A Roman synod of 445 restored Celidonius, and strictly confined the power of Hilarus to his own diocese; and, in order to secure the enforcement of these decisions, Leo I. sought and obtained the support of the secular government. June 6, 445, Valentinian III. issued the famous law, which, from regard to the merits of the apostle Peter, the dignity of the city of Rome, and the decisions of the Council of Nicaea (the spurious sixth canon), recognized the Bishop of Rome as the head of the Christian Church, binding all the ordinances as general laws, defined opposition to them as a kind of crimine læse majestatis, and ordered all secular authorities to arrest and surrender any person, who, summoned by the Pope, neglected to appear. Less effective was his interference in the affairs of the Church of Alexandria. In the fourth year he accused that church (Ep. 9) concerning certain ritual and liturgical differences. The Church of Rome, he argues, is built exclusively on Peter, the prince of the apostles; but how is it possible that his disciple Mark should have deviated from his master in founding the Alexandrian Church? The Alexandrian Church, however, seems to have had too lofty a self-consciousness to heed the anxious questions of the Pope.
Constantine exercised jurisdiction in Asia, Pontus, and Thrace after the Council of Chalcedon, just as he had done before.

The meeting between Leo I. and Attila, the king of the Huns, has been the subject of much legendary embellishment. After the battle of the Catalaunian fields (492), Attila broke into Italy, and Rome lay as a helpless prey between his claws, when, according to the report of Prosper of Aquitania, a contemporary of the event (see Roesler: *Chronica medii evi*, p. 325), on the instance of the emperor, Leo went to meet him, and made such an impression upon him, that he concluded peace, and retreated behind the Danube.

According to the *Historia ecclesiastica* (from the tenth century, edited by Eyssenhardt, 1869), Leo I. was not alone when he approached Attila, but was preceded by St. Peter himself, who, with sword in hand, compelled the Huns to submit to the demands of the bishop. There is, however, an entirely different version of what took place. According to an ordinance issued by Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, and found in Cassiodorus’ *Variae*, i. 4 (*Opera*, edit. Garetius, 1679), it was the elder Cassiodorus who went as ambassador to Attila, and induced him to retreat in peace. Which of these two reports is the true one, it is impossible to decide; probably they contain some truth, both of them.

As Attila’s position in Italy was very precarious, and we know the price he was paid for his retreat,—the sister of Valentinian II. and her dowry,—the event seems to have taken place in a very simple and natural way: As Attila’s position in Italy was very precarious, and we know the price he was paid for his retreat,—the sister of Valentinian III. and her dowry,—the event seems to have taken place in a very simple and natural way.

LIT. — The works of Leo I., consisting of letters and sermons, were collected and edited by Quenel (Lyons, 1700), Ballerini (Venice, 1755–57), and Mionx: *Patrologia*, 54–66. His life was written by many archbishops, bishops, and counts (Jena, 1859), and Saint-Jérém (Paris, 1845). See also Hirschsprung: *Das Kirchenrecht der Katholiken und Protestanten in Deutschland*, 1863, i. 583–588 (Illyria), 588–591 (Gaul).

Leo II. (582–683), a native of Sicily; a good Greek scholar, and well versed in music. His short reign devolved upon him a duty of whose full meaning he was hardly conscious. The sixth ecumenical council (held in Constantinople, 680) condemned the Monothelites and their leaders, among whom was the former Pope, Honorius; and the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus confirmed the condemnation already pronounced at Chalcedon. In July, 682, the papal legates brought the acts of the council, with a letter from the emperor, to Rome; and between September and December, same year, Leo II. answered, accepting the canons, and recognizing the condemnation, included Honorius among the condemned: *traditionis doctrina lustravit sed profana proditione immaculatam fidelis subvertere conatus est* (Mansi, 11, 728; Harduin, 8, 1470). He afterwards repeated the condemnation of Honorius in a letter to the bishops of Spain (Mansi, 11, 1050), and in another to Herweg, king of the Visigoths (Mansi, 11, 1054). See the literature to Honorius I.

Leo III., elected Dec. 26, 795; buried June 12, 816. His first act was to send the keys of the tomb of St. Peter and the standard of the city of Rome, together with many presents, to Charlemagne, asking him to send some of his nobles to Rome to receive the oath of allegiance from the people. Shortly after, he again addressed the Frankish king, but this time as a suppliant. There was a party in Rome strongly opposed to his election; and one day, during a procession, they attacked him. He was rescued by the Duke of Spoleto, and from Spoleto he repaired to the court of Charlemagne at Paderborn, where he was received with great ceremonies. Meanwhile, his adversaries raised very grave accusations against him; and, after his return to Rome (which city he entered Nov. 26, 796, accompanied by many archbishops, bishops, and counts), the plenipotentiaries of the king instituted an investigation, which, however, ended with the banishment of Leo’s enemies. The following year (800), Charlemagne himself arrived at Rome; and a new investigation was instituted, which ended with the Pope clearing himself from any guilt in the crimes alleged, by a solemn oath. Two days afterwards (Dec. 25), the crowning of Charlemagne as Roman emperor took place in the Church of St. Peter. The internal springs active in this event are still somewhat obscure. It is evident, however, that the idea put into circulation by the bull *Venerabilibus*, of Innocent III., — and according to which the Pope transferred the Roman Empire to the Franks in virtue of a divine authority, — was completely foreign to the actors themselves. Generally, the elevation of Charlemagne to Roman emperor was considered an elective act of the Roman people; and, in the performance of this act, the Pope played no other part than that of the first man of the people,—its representative. The relation between the new emperor and the Pope gives ample evidence. In the will of Charlemagne, signed by Leo himself, Rome is one of the metropolitan sees of his realm, besides Ravenna, Milan, etc. The imperial *Missus* in Rome held court in the name of the emperor, and was the sole administrator of criminal justice. He had, also, a kind of superintendence over the papal officials, and received appeals from them. After the death of Charlemagne, a conflict immediately arose between his successor, Louis the Pious, and the Pope. As soon as the report of the death of the emperor reached Rome, the opposition party renewed its attack on Leo III.; but the high-handed manner in which he put down the rising, the negligence with which he disposed of the Frankish kingdom, and an investigation was instituted, whose proceedings, however, were stopped by the death of the Pope. For the part which Leo took in the Adoptionist and the Filioque controversies, see those articles.

LIT. — The letters of Leo III. are found in *Jaffé: Reg. Pontif.*; his correspondence with Charlemagne, in *Monumenta Carolina in Jaffé: Bibl. ver. Germanic*, tom. iv.; his life, in the *Liber Pontificalis*, ii. (though much distorted).
LEO IV.

LEO IV. (April 10, 847–July 17, 855) restored and extended the fortifications of Rome, admonished by the frightful invasion of the Saracens in 846, by which the Church of St. Peter (at that time situated outside of the wall) was plundered, and immense treasures carried away by the enemy. By the extension of the wall originated the so-called Civitas Leonina." He also improved the fortifications of Ravenna, where he settled a number of Corsicans; but Leopolis, which he founded, instead of the destroyed Circumcellus some miles inland, did not thrive. Though the dependence of the Pope on the emperor still is strikingly illustrated by many events of the reign of Leo IV., a tendency towards independence now becomes noticeable. He begins his bulls with his own name, not with that of the person addressed. He gives the title of Dominus to no one, even not to the emperor. The acts of the synod of 853 are dated, not only from the year of the emperor, but also from that of the Pope, etc. His letters are found in JAFFÉ: Reg. Pontif.; his life, in Liber Pontificalis, iii.

LEO V. (903) reigned only between thirty and fifty days. He was imprisoned, and compelled to abdicate by his presbyter, Christophorus. The few notices of him still extant are found in WATTERICH: Vita Pontificum, i. 32.—Leo VI. (928–929) reigned for seven months, and five or fifteen days; but nothing is known of him. See WATTERICH, i. 33.—Leo VII. (January, 936–July, 939), a quiet and pious man, who left the government of Rome to Alberic II., the son of Marozia. He was very partial towards the monastery of Cluny, and made Archbishop Friedrich of Mayence papal vicar, and legate and primate of Germany. See his life by FLODOARDUS, in Muratori: Script. rer. Ital., IIP, 324; sources by JAFFÉ and WATTERICH.—Leo VIII. (963–965) was elected by the synod which deposed John XII. (Dec. 4, 963) under the influence of Otho I., but met with such an opposition from the Roman people, that he fled from Rome, and was deposed by a synod convened by John XII. (February, 964). John XII. died shortly after his death, but the Romans elected Benedict V. Pope. Otho I. once more reinstated Leo VIII. by armed force; but between February and April, 965, he died. Two bulls are ascribed to him,—the one returning the donations of Charlemagne, Pepin, Justinius, etc., to the emperor; and the other surrendering to the emperor the right of appointing bishops, archbishops, and bishops; but both bulls are evidently spurious, belonging to the period of the investiture-contest. The sources are found in JAFFÉ (Reg. Pont.) and WATTERICH (Vita Pontif.).

—Leo IX. (Feb. 12, 1049–April 19, 1054) descended from a noble family in Alsace: his father was a cousin to the emperor, Conrad II. He was bishop of Toul, when, in December, 1048, the emperor, Henry III., and the emissaries of the Roman people, at a meeting at Worms, agreed upon him as the successor of Damasus II. He accepted the offer, however, only on the condition that he should be unanimously elected by the clergy and people of Rome; and in February, 1049, he entered the city in a plain pilgrim's garb, accompanied by the young monk Hildebrand. His reign had great importance for the internal organization of the church. The reform which was started at Cluny, and thence spread widely among the monks, reached, through him, the church in general. The means he employed was the synod. With the exception of the period between 325 and 881, that vital organ of the church never was in greater activity than during the reign of Leo IX.; he dispersed the road, traveling from southern Italy to northern Germany, from the centre of France to the centre of Hungary,—he everywhere convened the clergy into synods, discussing the affairs of the church; and by consecrations, ordinations, etc., he everywhere knew how to awaken in the mass of the people an interest in what was going on in the church. The abolition of simony and the establishment of celibacy were his great aims. At one time he thought of deposing every clergyman who had obtained his benefice by simony; but he had to abandon this plan, as it would strike more than two-thirds of the officers of the church. The celibacy he extended to the orders of sub-deacon; and people already began to speak of unchaste priests, thereby meaning priests who were married. In his internal policy he was not so successful. The Normans had taken possession of Benevent; and, as the emperor proved unwilling to come to the defence of the holy see, the Pope himself marched against the intruders, at the head of an army of Italian mercenaries and Suabian volunteers. But he lost the battle at Astagonne, was taken prisoner, and held in captivity at Benevent, from June 23, 1063, to March 12, 1054. He was treated with the utmost respect by his Norman conquerors, but he was not released until he left them what they had taken in the form of papal fiefs. See the articles on BERENGAUr OF TOURS AND CERULARIUS, and his biographies by HUCKLEtt, 1851 (German) and SPACH, 1864 (French).

LEO X.

LEO X. (April 11, 1513–Dec. 1, 1519), b. at Florence, Dec. 11, 1475; the second son of Lorenzo the Magnificent and Clarissa Orsini; received the tonsure when he was seven years old, and was educated by his Norman conquerors, but he was not re-

The Mediceans were expelled from Florence, and
he himself found it advisable to keep aloof from Rome, journeying in Germany, Flanders, and France. But under Julius II. he was again in favor; and his luxurious residence in Rome swarmed with poets, philosophers, artists, and litterateurs of all descriptions. In the battle at Ravenna he held the supreme command, but was defeated. The French were transported to France; but in Milan he escaped, and returned to Florence. While there, he heard of the death of Julius II. (Feb. 21, 1513). He was sick from a disease which cannot be spoken of, and which was never cured (Gregorovius: Geschichte der Stadt Rom, viii. 197). Nevertheless, he hastened to Rome, and arrived in time to make a bargain with a party of the cardinals (Höfler: Zur Kritik und Quellenkunde, etc., in the Memoirs of the Imperial Academy of Vienna, Philos.-Hist. Classe, vol. xxviii.). He was elected and enthroned under the loud applause of the people.

His foreign policy, always ambiguous, and often false, had in reality no other aim than the aggrandizement of the house of Medici,—the throne of Naples for his brother Julian, and Tuscany, with Ferrara and Urbino, for his nephew Lorenzo. For this purpose he connived at the French plans against Milan, and formed a secret alliance with Louis XII. On the accession of Francis I. he offered to renew the alliance, on the condition of the surrender of the crown of Naples to Julian; and, when Francis declined, he immediately joined the anti-French league. But the brilliant victory at Marignano (Sept. 13, 1515) compelled him to throw himself on the mercy of Francis I.; and at their meeting at Bologna, in December, he had to consent to the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction and the establishment of a concordat, which gave the king, within his realm, the right of ecclesiastical jurisdiction (except in a few cases) and the right of ecclesiastical appointment, only that the annates were paid into the papal treasury. The crown of Naples should go to the house of Valois; and compensation to the house of Medici was spoken of only in very vague terms. Meanwhile, the golden spring stopped running, however much its waters were needed. It cost money to keep Raphael and Michelangelo busy, to buy manuscripts, form libraries, and found universities, to make all his friends and favorites happy; and yet the sums spent in those ways were very small indeed when compared with what he squandered on frivolous luxury, or sunk in ambitious schemes. When he died,—to the despair of his creditors,—there was not money enough in the treasury to pay for the funeral candles.


Leo XI. (elected April 1, consecrated April 10, d. April 27, 1605) belonged to the family of Medici. See Petruccelli della Gattina: Hist. diplom. des conclaves, ii. 404-452.

Leo XII. (Sept. 28, 1823—Feb. 10, 1829), Annibale della Genga, b. Aug. 22, 1790; descended from a noble family in the Romagna; was ordained priest in 1783, and made archbishop of Tyre in 1793, and cardinal in 1816. After the death of Pius VII., he carried the conclave, principally because he was a decided adversary of Consalvi. Nevertheless, all the principal acts of his reign,—the close approach to France, the strict measures against the Carbonari, the jubilee of 1825, the organization of the church in the South-American republics, the assertions for the emancipation of the Roman Catholics in England, the direct influence of Consalvi. In spite of his encyclical of May 3, 1824, which condemned the maxims of tolerance as identical with indifferentionism, and contained some very harsh invectives against the Bible societies, the general character of his reign was moderation. See Sartaud de Montval: Les papes du pape Leo XII. (Paris, 1843, 2 vols.), of which Scherer's Leo XII. (Schaaffhausen, 1844) is only a miserable compilation. Kötzler: Leo XII. und der Geist der röm. Hierarchie, Leipzig, 1846; Wiseman: Recollections of the Four Last Popes, Lon-
Leo XIII., the present Pope (March 3, 1878), was created a cardinal by Pius IX., November 15, 1853. He entered the order of the Augustinians, and in 1561 he was appointed professor of theology at Salamanca. As he always, in his studies, went back to the sources,—the Scriptures and the Fathers,—his enemies succeeded in making him suspected of being connected with the Reformation; and he spent five years in the dungeons of the Inquisition, but was finally acquitted in 1571. The acts of his process were published in Madrid, 1847. See also José Gonzales de Tejada: Vida de Fray Luis de Leon, Madrid, 1863. He also distinguished himself as a poet. His poetical works were published in a collected edition in Madrid, 1804—16, 6 vols. See Ticknor: History of Spanish Literature, Boston, 1864, 2d ed., ii. 75—87.

Leon of Neapolis—See above.

LEON XI. This disease—one of the most fearful of ancient and modern times—was insidious in its onset, but generally keeping steadily on its destructive course, in spite of all the skill of medical art—has existed from times preceding the ages which history takes cognizance of in its backward sweep, has spread widely over the civilized and barbarous world, and still exists endemically in some regions. The Hebrews were sorely afflicted with it before leaving Egypt (indeed, the banks of the Nile, with their humid atmosphere, seem to have been a cradle of the disease); so much so, that, according to the historian Manetho (Josephus: Cont. Ap., i. 26), the Egyptians drove them out on account of leprosy before they came, bringing it with them into that country. From Egypt and Palestine it spread to Greece and Italy, and other countries bordering upon the Mediterranean. It appears to have been introduced into Central and Western Europe somewhere between the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, probably through the agency of the returning crusaders, and spread with alarming rapidity. Towards the end of the fifteenth century, it had almost disappeared from those sections of Europe, and somewhat curiously, as it disappeared, syphilis appeared, thus giving ground for the opinion of some authors, that syphilis is a debased form of leprosy; but this view is no longer held. At present, leprosy, or Elephantiasis Grecorum, is found on the coasts and islands of the Mediterranean, Black, and Caspian Seas, in Norway, Asia Minor, Syria, and Palestine, on the coasts of the Indian and China Seas, in the islands of the Australian Archipelago, in South and Central America, and in Iceland.

By almost all peoples and races, leprosy has been regarded as a visitation of God on account of some sins and other wrongs, and come from the rest of the people. The Jews were told that it came upon a man for idolatry, blasphemy, unchastity, theft, slander, false witness, false judgment, perjury, infringing the borders of a neighbor, devising malicious plans, or creating discord between brothers. Lepers were considered unclean (Lev. xiii. 44—46), had to rend their garments (excepting in the case of the women), cover their faces, go with unkempt hair, and cry, "Unclean, unclean!" They had to live without the camp or city; had a special part of the synagogue reserved for them: and any thing they touched, or into whatever vessel, the leprosy was declared unclean. An elaborate ceremonial was prescribed for the cleansing of the leper when the disease had left him; for which see Lev. xiv. Amongst the Jews, not only was leprosy considered as attacking human beings, but also it was declared to be in garments, houses, and vessels (Lev. xiii. 47—50 and xiv. 38—53); and ceremonials were prescribed for their cleansing. The exact nature of this leprosy of garments and houses is not known. Its distinctive signs were, in a garment, greenish or reddish spots, which spread;
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in a house, greenish or reddish streaks lower than the surface of the wall, which spread. This was, probably, in either case, a species of mildew, or else indicated the presence of some fungus, which, by the way, was found on these rivers. The Targum of Palestine regarded it as a visitation on a house built with unjust gains.

The Persians went even farther than the Jews, and excluded foreign lepers from their country. The Greek writers thought leprosy was a punishment for some sin against Phebus. The Arabs will neither sleep near, eat with, lepers, nor marry into a family known to be leprous. By the Church of Rome in early ages, lepers were regarded as dead, and the last rites of the church were said over them. In 757 A.D. it was declared a ground for divorce, and the sound party could marry again. In France, at different times, laws were passed forbidding lepers to marry. The leper lost all control of his property, and could not inherit any: he could not act as a witness, nor challenge to a duel. Oddly enough, while, in general, leprosy was regarded as a punishment, in some parts of Europe it was held to be a sign of divine preference for those attacked; it was a sign of great virtue, to preserve her chastity. They were regarded as saints, and rendered much honor and alms. All over Europe the lepers had to live apart, and had special churches, priests, etc. In the fifteenth century a special dress was prescribed for them. The houses in which these unfortunate ones lived were called "lazar-houses." They were generally located just outside the gates of the cities, in close proximity to some body of water; so that the inmates could bathe. They were usually religious in character. The inmates had to be silent, and attend morning prayer and mass; and in some of the houses they had to say so many prayers each day, that they had very little time for anything else. No woman was allowed to enter the male lazars-houses, excepting the washerwoman; and she had to be of sober age and good manners, and must enter the house at a fixed time of day, when she could be seen of all. A female relative had to obtain special permission before she could speak to a male leper. These houses were supported largely by begging, entirely by alms.

Frequently leprosy is hereditary, the disease lying dormant in the system for a number of years, to break out at or after the age of puberty. By proper hygiene the outbreak may be prevented. Often the etiology is obscure, and various conjectures have been formed as to it. Doubtless it is due to some poison in the blood. It is seen mostly in localities where air and earth are humid, as upon the coasts of seas, banks of rivers, and on islands; and the climatic is probably the largest factor in its production. Thus, during the forty-years' wandering of the Jews in the desert, with its dry atmosphere, it is likely that fewer cases occurred than when in the land of Egypt. That fungus has any great influence upon the development of the disease is questionable, though it would seem that bad water, salt or decayed fish, salt meat, etc., aggravate the disease. It has been thought by some commentators that the Jews were forbidden to eat pork on account of its tendency to produce leprosy. Violent outbreaks of passion have been assigned as a cause, as in the case of Uzziah, who, in a fit of passion, performed a priestly office (2 Chron. xxvi. 21). By the ancients it was thought to be contagious, but this theory has recently lost ground. By some, the disease is regarded as of nervous origin. As to sex, more males are attacked than females. Neither rich nor poor are exempt. Some authorities now claim to have found a parasite peculiar to leprosy.

Between what is called "leprosy" in our version of the Bible, and the leprosy as described by the best authorities on skin diseases, there is very little correspondence: indeed, the writer is inclined to adopt the theory advanced in the article on leprosy in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible (American edition, vol. ii. p. 1630), that the leprosy of the Mosaic dispensation (Lepra Mosaica) is not one disease, but an enumeration of certain symptoms, which, on account of their frightful character, and tendency to spread, would render the individual an object of aversion, and demand his separation. It is certainly but in few points akin to Elephantiasis Grecorum, the modern leprosy. The symptoms of leprosy, as in Lev. xiii., and the expression used there and elsewhere,—leprous, "white as snow,"—lead one to conjecture that the Lepra Mosaica is analogous to the Lepra vulgaris, more commonly called Psoriasis. For the sake of clearness we will give briefly the biblical leprosy, and then the modern form. It must be remembered that diseases have a tendency to change their form as they move from land to land, and this may account somewhat for the marked difference in the diseases now presented.

Leprosy (Heb. Tzara'ath), leprosy of Lev. xiii. and xiv. Its most marked symptoms were "a rising, a scab, or a bright spot," "in the skin of the flesh." (Lev. xiii. 2), with a hair turned white in the rising, scab, or bright spot, these being deeper than the scar-skin (xiii. 3), and spreading of the scab, etc. (xiii. 7, 8). As a more advanced case we have "quick raw flesh in the rising" (xiii. 10). In verse 18 we find that the disease may take its origin in a boil, with the same symptoms. In verse 20 we have the disease appearing in the beard, or hair of the head,—a great calamity to the Jew, who was so proud of his beard; and here it comes in the form of a scall, with thin yellow hairs in the patches. These are all the symptoms we have; and they are probably given merely as initial symptoms, so that the priest should recognize the onslaught of different diseases in their earliest stages. The "rising" may correspond to the tubercles of Lepra tuberculosa, or the bullae of Lepra anæsthetica of the most recent authors. The scall of the head may be the Morphaa alpemrita, or Portmange, placed by Kopos (Hautkrankheiten, Wien, 1880) as a subdivision of the second form of leprosy,—the Lepra maculosa. In verses 12-17 we read, that, if the patient be white all over, he is clean, no doubt because the disease had then run its course. In this case it is probably a general Psoriasis.

Modern leprosy, the Elephantiasis Grecorum, is divided into three varieties: (1) Lepra tuberosa, the tubercular form; (2) Lepra maculosa, the spotted or streaked form; (3) Lepra anæsthetica, the anaesthetic form. For months or years before the outbreak of the disease, the patient may have vague prodromal symptoms, as weakness, loss,
of appetite, sleeplessness, lassitude, slight fever, diarrhea, and sometimes *pemphigus bleo* (little blisters). In the *Lepra tuberosa* the disease begins with the outbreak, on the general surface of the body, of irregular or round shaped spots, in size from that of a pin-head to the palm of the hand; at first red, and disappearing under pressure; soon becoming gray to sepias or brown or bronze color. Over the spots the skin is smooth and glistening (as if painted with oil), or bronzed and thickened, or slightly prominent, and painful on pressure. The spots are distributed over the trunk and extremities,—face, hands, and feet. In some situations they become confluent; in some disappear; in others disappear in the centre, while the peripheries extend, thus forming ring shapes. The tubercles, the distinctive type of this form, appear after the disease has lasted months, or may be years; are of various sizes, up to that of a hazelnut at the surface of the skin, or somewhat protruding; dirty-brown-red and glistening; hard, elastic to soft to the touch, covered with epidermis scales; diffuse, or closely pressed together, and forming, either irregular uneven plaques, or regular parallel rows, projecting over the eyes; on the face and ears. On the eyebrows they form thick parallel rows, projecting over the eyes; on the cheeks, nose, and chin they are massed into irregular heaps. The lips become thick, swollen, and protruding; the under-lip hangs down; and this, with the prominent, overhanging, knotty eyebrows, and the deeply-wrinkled forehead, gives the countenance a morose and stupid appearance. Sometimes the eyelids are everted, and the lobes of the ears hang down in thick masses. Consequent upon the eversion of the eyelids, disease of the eye sets in. The extremities also become tuberculated, though not so much as the face; and the presence of tubercles in the palms of the hands and soles of the feet render handling and walking very painful. Tubercles appear in the mucus membrane of the mouth, pharynx, and upper part of larynx; the tongue becoming thick and cracked, with loss of taste ensuing; the larynx becoming narrow, with loss of voice; the breath becoming sweetish. After many months, these tubercles may be absorbed, leaving behind dark pigmented atrophic places: sometimes they soften centrally, and spread out peripherally; sometimes break down, and form leprous ulcers, which tend to skin over, only to break down again. Sometimes the ulceration goes deeper; necrosis joins itself to it; a diffused inflammation sets in, leading, in the under extremities especially, to deep excavation, and finally opening of joints, and self-amputation of entire members (*Lepra mutilans*). Earlier or later elephantiasis develops in different parts of the body, and the ulnar nerve will be found enlarged and cordy. The disease is generally chronic, lasting some eight to ten years, the patient dying of specific marasmus, or some complicating disease of internal organs. Or the disease may be more acute, with high fever, and reaching in a few months to a state which in other cases is not reached in years. This disease is supposed to have been the one with which Job was afflicted, though this is questioned. The *Lepra mucosa* is characterized by the appearance on the skin of a large number of red or brown glistening spots, or by diffuse dark pigmentation, intermixed with which are white points, spots, or stripes; so that the body seems streaked. This frequently changes into the former variety, or into the *Lepra aethanesthesia*, in which anaesthesia is the marked feature. It succeeds to the preceding forms, or else begins with an outbreak of *pemphigus bullae* (water-blisters), which, on healing, leave white, glistening, and anaesthetic spots, or, breaking, leave ulcerations. Sometimes anaesthesia appears on fully normal places: sometimes the spot has been red and hyperesthetic for months before. Over the anaesthetic spots the skin often becomes wrinkled, the wrinkled places being bounded by a red, hyperesthetic border; the wrinkled only taking place where the anaesthetic spots have become stable, for at first they tend to change their location. The anaesthesia is complete, the patient not feeling a needle thrust deep into the muscles. The chief nerve-trunks become swollen, and painful to touch. Sometimes hyperesthesia precedes anaesthesia to such a degree, that the patient is not able to sit or lie for any length of time in one place, cannot take any thing in his hands, nor walk; taking something gives him the greatest pain. The anaesthesia is followed by atrophy of muscles, and wrinkling; the sphincter muscle of the eye becomes lamened; the under eyelid and the under-lip hang down; the tears flow over the cheeks; and the saliva runs dribbling out of the mouth; and thus the face of times, already swollen and out of shape by the presence of the tubercles, assumes a peculiar, old, idiotic, foolish expression. The flexor muscles of the hand not being atrophied so much as the extensor, the fingers become half bent, the hollow of the hand becomes convex and pressed forward, the back of the hand bent in; the fingers becomes clubbed; finger-nails thinned; the hair falls out. Ulceration finally sets in in the anaesthetic places, or the tissues gradually atrophy away till the skin, fasciae, tendons, disappear, one or another joint is laid bare, when suddenly the whole foot, hand, or extremity falls off. Patient grows foolish and apathetic, and dies after a lapse of eighteen to nineteen years.

The tubercles are composed of a granulation membrane rich in cells, which follows the walls of the vessels, and spreads out from them through the whole thickness of the skin, setting up, by the pressure caused by its presence, a disturbance of circulation and function of the skin; and, extending into the deeper parts, gives rise to a painless suppuration of the joints. The tubercles are also deposited in the main nerve-trunks, at first only in their sheaths, but ultimately pressing in between the fibres.

Treatment is only symptomatic. The best is to remove the patient from leprous regions.

The lepers whom our Lord healed were probably not afflicted with *Elephantiasis Grecorum*, but with *Elephantiasis vulgares* (*Psoiriasis*). Outside of the case of Benjamin, the house for lepers, managed by a Moravian couple, who, in a truly Christ-like spirit, care for these wretched and disgusting sufferers.

Leprosy is biblically regarded as an emblem of sin, because of its loathsomeness, its afflicting every part, and its incurability, save upon divine intervention. Again, as leprosy excluded one
from the abodes of mortals, sin excludes us from heaven, the abode of God.


W. MÖLLER.

LESLEY, John, b. in Scotland, 1527; d. in a monastery at Gartenby near Brussels, May 31, 1596. He was educated at the university of Aberdeen, where he became canon in 1547. He was a vigorous champion of the Roman faith and of Mary Queen of Scots. He appeared against Knox in the dispute at Edinburgh (1561), and, as one of the commissioners, brought Mary to Scotland. In 1565 he was made Bishop of Rose. He shared the misfortunes of the royal cause, and participated in, indeed originated, some of the innumerable intrigues Mary connived at. For this conduct he suffered imprisonment. But he made good use of his enforced leisure by gathering materials for his De origine monasteriorum, a history of Scotland, in ten books, down to 1561, published at Rome, 1578; reprinted in Holland, 1675. Upon this work his fame rests; but he also wrote much in defence of Mary, and for her benefit composed Pia afficti et tranquilli animi consolationes, et tranquilli animi munimentum, Paris, 1574. He was released in 1573, went to the Continent, endeavored to enlist foreign princes in behalf of Mary. In 1593 he was made Bishop of Coutances in Normandy, but soon after, wearied with life, retired to a monastery. See his Life, London, 1885.

LESLEY, Charles, author of A Short and Easy Method with the Deists; b. at Raphoe, County Donegal, Ireland, 1650; d. at Glaslough, Monaghan, April 13, 1722. His father (d. 1671) had been bishop of the Orkneys, of Raphoe, and of Clogher successively. Charles was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, in 1671; removed to England, and studied law at the Temple, but in 1680 took orders in the Church of England. He returned to Ireland in 1687; became chancellor of the Cathedral of Connor, but lost his position in consequence of his refusal to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary. In this he was true to his family traditions (for his father had been a privy councillor to Charles I.) and to his declared preferences. In 1689 he went to England, and for twenty years lived un molested, carrying vigorously on his controversies against Quakers, Socinians, Roman Catholics, Jews, and, above all, Deists. In 1710 he published The Good Old Cause; or, lying in Truth,—a pamphlet against Bishop Burnet, with whom he had had previously a controversy on the doctrine of passive obedience, to which he as a non-juror held; and soon after fled to the Pretender, at Bar-le-Duc. He staid faithfully in the Pretender's service, tried to win the latter to Protestantism, shared his hopes and misfortunes; but in 1721 he obtained permission to return home, where he soon after died.

Leslie is now remembered principally by one book, A Short and Easy Method with the Deists, wherein the Certainty of the Christian Religion is demonstrated by Infallible Proof from Four Rules, which are Incompatible to any Imposition that ever has been, or that can possibly be, London, 1897 (often reprinted, e.g., in Bohn's Christian Evidences, Lon-
LESSING, Gotthold Ephraim, b. at Kamenz in Upper Lusatia, Jan. 22, 1729; d. at Brunswick, Feb. 16, 1781. His father, a Lutheran minister, took him out of the school of Kamenz, because the rector, in an opening address, had called the theatre a school of atheism and unbridled licentiousness. Nevertheless, when in 1746 young Lessing was sent to the university of Leipzig to study theology, it was the stage, where just at that moment the famous actress Neuber shone her brightest, which occupied the larger portion of his attention. He studied theology, philosophy, and philology; and in each of these departments of science he, in course of time, not only accumulated a vast amount of knowledge, but acquired real insight. Nevertheless, aesthetics, literature, and more especially the drama, formed the true field of his genius. In 1748 a brief but aggressive pamphlet, in which Lessing endeavored to prove that the facts of Christianity have these marks, therefore Christianity is the true religion. Besides this work, he wrote many others: A Short and Easy Method with the Jews (1698); The Truth of Christianity demonstrated in a Dialogue betwixt a Christian and a Deist, wherein the Case of the Jews is likewise considered; The Snake in the Grass (1699, against the Quakers), etc. Dr. Johnson said he "was a reasoner, and a reasoner who was not to be reasoned against." Bishop Horne mentions that he (Leslie) "is said to have brought more persons from other persuasions into the Church of England than any man ever did." Leslie was an intense High-Churchman, and applied to the Dissenters the same rough-shod logic he did to the Deists; declaring, that, since they had not possession of the ground, they must show sense and cause why they should exist. His activity as a politician was quite as great as a theologian. For nearly seven years (1704-11) he maintained a paper entitled Rehearsals, or a View of the Times, their Principles and Practices (2d ed. 1750, 6 vols.), "printed in London, at first once, and afterwards twice, in each of these departments of science he, in course of time, not only accumulated a vast amount of knowledge, but acquired real insight. Nevertheless, aesthetics, literature, and more especially the drama, formed the true field of his genius. In 1748 Neuber brought out Lessing's first play (Der junge Gelehrte) on the stage; and in the same year Lessing removed to Berlin, where, with various incidental interruptions, he resided till 1760. In Berlin he exclusively occupied himself with literary work, though for some time he still wore the title of Studiois magnesium. He made the acquaintance of Voltaire, whose pleas in the notorious suit against Hirsch he translated into German. He also made the acquaintance of Mendelssohn and Nicolai, with whom he edited the Briefe, die neueste Literatur betreffend. Many of his criticisms attracted attention. His new drama, Miss Sara Sampson (1755), produced a sensation. He began to make a name for himself. In 1760 he accepted a position as secretary to Gen. von Tautentzien at Breslau, and there he remained till 1765. The life in the barracks did not displease him; and he found time to continue his studies, and write Laokoon and Minna von Barnhelm. The prospect of a position as librarian in Berlin allured him away from Breslau, but deceived him. In 1767 he went to Hamburg as a kind of artistic director of the theatre of the city; and the afterwards twice, in the form of a dialogue, and entirely confined to the state of public affairs." He collected and published his Theological Works himself, London, 1721, 2 vols. folio. They have since been republished (Oxford, 1832, 7 vols. 8vo), with a Life prefixed.

Even his dogmatical works, Handbuch d. christ. Religionstheorie, etc., have a decidedly practical and apologetical character. See his biography by Holheiser. Hanover, 1797. WAGENKNECHT.
the instance of Schleiermacher, consider the personal relation to the person of the Saviour, and not the doctrinal system, as the essence of Christianity, the lessing was, in spirit of the doctrine, to which he always nourished for Jesus of Nazareth, not a Christian man. His theological stand-point is very difficult to define. First, as he confesses himself, he often spoke as a learner, not as a teacher. Next, he evidently went through no important development during the latter part of his life, for he remained pretty much the same as he was before. F. H. Jacob has published a conversation which he held with Lessing at Wittenbütel, July 6 and 7, 1780; but it does not show that Lessing ended a confirmed Spinozist; while Wackernagel, Stirn, and others think that they have discovered in his Erzie- hung des Menschenlebchrechts a decided progress towards Christianity. Both these opinions are probably somewhat exaggerated. The truth seems to be, that, even at the end of his life, Lessing's theological stand-point was still in the process of formation; that is, unfinished, unsettled.

Lessius, Leonhard, b. at Brecht-in-Brabant, Oct 1, 1554; d. at Louvain, Jan. 5, 1623. He was a member of the Society of Jesu, and teacher of philosophy and theology at Louvain. He owed his reputation principally to his work on morals, Libri IV. de Justitia, 1586 (afterwards often reprinted), though it shows the same marks of sophistry as most works on morals by Jesuits. At present he is remembered chiefly on account of the part he took in the Augustinian controversies. The Pope having condemned seventy-six propositions in the writings of Bajus (1567), Lessius went so far in his polemics that the facul- ty of Louvain, in 1587, found occasion to condemn as Pelagian thirty-four propositions drawn from his works and those of Hamel, another Jesuit. See ALEGAMBE: Bibl. Script. Societatis Jesu, p. 301.

Levantine, Synod of. At Latine, or Lestines, a royal villa near Binche in Hainault, the second Austrasian synod during the reign of Carloman was held, probably in 743. The acts of that synod are in many respects nothing but a confirmation of the acts of the first Austrasian synod of 742. At some points, however, the tendency of model- ling on the ecclesiastical organization of Austrasia appears in many respects nothing but a confirmation from his works and those of amel, another Jesuit. See ALEGAMBE: Bibl. Script. Societatis Jesu, p. 301.

Levita, described in a highly poetical, but not a legendary or hyperbolical, manner, in Job. xli., is probably, in that passage, the crocodile, which Tristram thus describes: "The head, back, and tail are covered with quadrangular horny plates or scales, which not only protect the body, a rifle-ball glancing off from them as from a rock, but also serve as ballast, enabling the creature to sink rapidly, on being disturbed, by merely expelling the air from its lungs." The crocodile is now rarely seen, even in Upper Egypt, although once common up to the very mouth of the Nile. The "leviathan" of Ps. xxxiv. 14 and Isa. xxvii. 1 is also the crocodile; but in Ps. civ. 20 the word is probably used of the whale. By "whirlpool," in the margin of Job xli. (A.V.), is probably meant a sperm-whale. See EASTWOOD and WRIGHT: Bible Word Book.

Levirate Marriage. This is the name applied to an ancient usage of the Hebrews (Gen. xxxviii.), and re-ordained by Moses (Deut. xxv. 5-10), that, when an Israelite died without leaving male issue, his brother resident with him was compelled to marry the widow (cf. also Matt. xxii. 24). The first-born son issuing from this marriage was to continue the deceased brother's family, that his name be not put out of Israel. In case a man only left daughters, and no brother to marry his widow, then the daughters were married to men belonging to the same tribe, who had to keep up the name and patrimony of the deceased. In case a man left children, the brother who was not allowed to marry the deceased's wife (Lev. xvii. 16, xx. 21). In case of a brother living in a far distance, he was dispensed from the levirate law. When there was no brother alive, the levirate law, as we see from the case of Ruth, extended to the nearest relative of the deceased husband.

As sometimes damages were connected with an other marriage, a good many tried to get rid of the levirate law. There existed no legal objection, but a moral one, in a certain sense. In case of unwillingness, the brother's wife could cite him before the elders. If he there insisted upon his right, the case was tried by the court. If after that of the primitive Church stands out quite prominently, and with respect to immense secularization, under the Carolingians, of the estates of the Church, which almost amounted to a formal diviso between Church and State, the acts are of great interest. See PAUL ROTHS: D. Säkularisation des Kirchenguts unter den Karolingern.
nearest kinsman who resigned the right or duty (being neither the brother-in-law of Ruth nor Mahlon's brother) drew off his shoe. This plucking of the shoe was a symbol of ceding a property. The widow was not to marry another man so long as she thought it possible that her brother-in-law would fulfill his duty: if she did, such a connection was regarded as adultery, and the offender was burnt (Gen. xxxviii. 24). High priests (Lev. xxii. 14) were not bound to adhere to this law. That this law was yet in full power in the time of Jesus, we see from Matt. xxii. 24 sq.

LEVITES. The Levites are the descendants of Levi, the third son of Jacob, by Leah (Gen. xxix. 34, xxxv. 25). This name was given to him by his mother, with the assurance, "This time will my husband be joined unto me." One fact only is recorded of him, the deed treated of Levi, the third son of Jacob, by Leah (Gen. xxix. 34, xxxv. 25 sq.). LEYRER.

In the time of Jesus, we see gom Matt. xxii. 24 sq. LEVYER.

When, after the making of the golden calf, Moses called upon those who were on the Lord's side, the Levites gathered themselves together unto him, and slew those who had sinned (Exod. xxxi. 26 sq.). In them the zeal of their progenitor was revived, and the tribe of Levi should be relieved from the temporal pur-
suit of the rest of the people to enable them to give themselves wholly to their spiritual functions. For this reason they were to have no territorial possessions, but Jehovah was to be their inheritance (Num. xviii. 20; Deut. x. 9). Therefore it was ordained that they should receive from the produce of the tithes of the produce of the land, from which the Levites, in their turn, had to offer a tithe to the priests (Num. xviii. 21–24 sq.). The Levites could eat the tithes everywhere. As if to provide for the contingency of failing crops, or the like, and the consequent inadequacy of the tithes thus assigned to them, the Levite, no less than the widow and the orphan, was commended to the special kindness of the people (Deut. xii. 19, xiv. 27, 29).

As an above, the Levites, according to Num. xxxv. 6, received forty-eight cities, together with their suburbs, six of which were to be cities of refuge. This provision also applied to the priests. Afterwards, however, thirteen of the forty-eight cities were assigned to the priests (Josh. xxii. 4 sq.) in the territories of Judah, Benjamin, and Simeon. Of the remaining thirty-five cities belonging to the Levites, ten were in the territories of Ephraim, Dan, and Half Manasseh (West), thirteen in Half Manasseh (East), Issachar, Asher, and Naphtali, and twelve in Zebulon, Reuben, and Gad. But the Levites were by no means the sole occupants or proprietors: they were simply to have in them those houses which they required as dwellings, and the fields necessary for the pasture of their cattle. This is evident from the fact that the Levites were allowed to sell their houses: otherwise Lev. xxv. 32 sq. would have no meaning, unless it is presumed that other Israelites lived together with the Levites.

That the Levites in the time of the Judges did not occupy all the cities allotted to them, may be seen from the fact that Ajalon (Josh. xxii. 24; Judg. i. 35) and Gezer (Josh. xxii. 21) were, like many other cities, not in the possession of the Israelites. The very fact that not all Canaanites were driven out from the land made it impossible to carry out the provisions for the Levites; and thus many of the Levites allotted to them were not able to go to those allotted to the Levites (comp. Judg. xvii. 7, xix. 1). That, in spite of these troublesome times, the office of the Levites was known among the people, may be seen from Judg. xvii. xix.: otherwise we could not understand why Micah (Judg. xvii. 13) should rejoice for having a Levite for his priest.

The activity of David in behalf of the cultus also included the re-organization of the Levitical order. When the ark was carried up to Jerusalem, their claim to be the bearers of it was publicly acknowledged (1 Chron. xvi. 2). The Levites engaged in conveying the ark were divided into six father's houses, headed by six chiefs, four belonging to Kohath, one to Gershon, and one to Merari (1 Chron. xxv. 5 sq.). Of special importance is the Levites being employed for the first time in choral service (1 Chron. xv. 16 sq., xvi. 4): others, again, were appointed as doorkeepers (1 Chron. xxiii. 23, 24). Still the thorough re-organization of the whole tribe was effected by David in the last days of his life, when he thought of building the temple. The Levites, from thirty years of age and upward, were, first of all, numbered, when it was found that they were thirty-eight thousand (1 Chron. xxiii. 2, 3). Of these, twenty-four thousand were appointed to assist the priests in the work of the sanctuary, six thousand as judges and scribes, four thousand as gate-keepers, and four thousand as musicians. Like the priests, the first class, or twelve of the assistants, were subdivided into twenty-four courses, of which six belonged to Gershon, nine to Kohath, and nine to Merari. The second class, or the musicians, were subdivided into twenty-four choirs, each headed by a chief (1 Chron. xxiv.), and assisted by eleven masters belonging to the same family. Four of the chiefs were sons of Asaph, a descendant of Gershon (1 Chron. xxv. 2); six were sons of Jeduthun, also called Ethan, a descendant of Merari (1 Chron. xxv. 3); and fourteen were sons of Hosaiah, a descendant of Kohath (1 Chron. xxv. 4). The third class, or gate-keepers, too, were subdivided into twenty-four courses, and were headed by twenty-four chiefs from the three great families of Levi: seven were sons of Meshelemiah, a descendant of Kohath; thirteen were from Obed-edom, a descendant of Gershon; and four were sons of Hosaiah, a descendant of Merari. These families had to supply the temple daily with twenty-four sentinel-pasts. For the fourth class, or judges and scribes, see 1 Chron. xxvi. 29 sq. This re-organization effected by David was adopted by his son Solomon when the temple was completed (2 Chron. viii. 14 sq.).

Different from the Levites were the Nethinim, who performed the menial work for the Levites: hence they are mentioned along with the Levites (1 Chron. ix. 2; Ez. vii. 24 sq.). The original stock of the Nethinim were probably the Gibeonites, whom Joshua made "hewers of wood, and drawers of water" (Josh. ix. 27). The Nethinim of 1 Chron. ix. 2, Ez. ii. 43, were probably sprung from captives taken by David in the later wars, who were assigned to the service of the tabernacle, replacing possibly the Gibeonites, who had been slain by Saul (2 Sam. xxxi. 1). Undoubtedly these Nethinim were obliged to keep the Mosaic law. From Neh. x. 29 sq. we know that such was the case in the time of the prophet Nehemiah. But to return to the Levites. The revolt of the ten tribes, and the policy pursued by Jeroboam, obliged the Levites to leave the cities assigned to them in the territory of Israel, and gather round the metropolis of Judah (2 Chron. ii. 17 sq.). In the Bible history of Judah the Levites are scarcely mentioned: yet when they are, it is in a way which presupposes the existence of Levitical institutions. They are sent out by Jehoshaphat to instruct and judge the people (2 Chron. xix. 8–10). Prophets of their order encourage the king in his war against Moab and Ammon, and go before his army with their loud hallelujahs (2 Chron. xx. 21). They became especially prominent under Hezekiah, as consecrating themselves to the special work of cleansing and repairing the temple (2 Chron. xxxix. 12–13); and the hymns of David and of Asaph were again restored, and their old privileges were restored, and the payment of tithes was renewed (2 Chron. xxxiii. 4). The prominence into which they had been brought by Hezekiah and Josiah had apparently tempted the Levites to think that they might encroach permanently on the special functions of the priesthood; and thus
the sin of Korah was renewed (Ezek. xlii. 10-14, xlvii. 11). After the Captivity, the first body of returning exiles had but few Levites (Ez. ii. 36-40). Those who did come took their old parts at the foundation and dedication of the second temple (Ez. iii. 10, vi. 18). In the next movement under Ezra their reluctance was even more strongly marked. None of them presented themselves at the first great gathering (Ez. viii. 13). According to a Jewish tradition (Mishna, Sota, ix. 10), Ezra is said to have punished the backwardness of the Levites by depriving them of their tithes, and transferring the right to the priest; but Neh. x. 38, xiii. 10, is against this tradition. Under Nehemiah the number of the Levites had greatly increased.

Among those who returned from the exile were the Nethinim also. Their number was six hundred and twelve, of whom three hundred and ninety-two returned with Zerubbabel (Ez. ii. 58, Neh. vii. 90), and two hundred and twenty with Ezra (Ez. viii. 20), under the leadership of Zilah and Zerahiah (Neh. xi. 21). Some of them lived in the proximity of the temple (Neh. iii. 26); others dwelt with the Levites in their own cities (Ez. ii. 70). They were exempted from taxation by the Persian satrap (Ez. vii. 24), because of belonging to the temple. With the destruction of the temple, the order of the Levites, as well as of the priests, lost its significance: the synagogue is not the temple proper, the order of the Levites, as well as of the priests, lost its significance: the synagogue is not in need of it; although there are up to this day among the Jews some who claim to be descendents of Levi, and as such enjoy some prerogatives in the synagogue cultus.

LEVITICUS. See PENTATEUCH.

LEWIS, Taylor, L.L.D., L.H.D., b. in Northumberland, Saratoga County, N.Y., March 27, 1802; d. in Schenectady, N.Y., May 11, 1877. He was prepared for college by Dr. Proudfit of Salem, N.X.; was graduated from Union College, Schenectady, in 1820; studied law with Judge S. A. Foot at Albany; commenced practice at Fort Miller in 1824; married, and became principal of the academy at Waterford, in 1833; professor of Greek and Latin in the University of the City of New York in 1838; professor of Greek in Union College in 1840, and afterwards of Oriental languages and biblical literature; which position he retained till his death. In early life he became a member, in full communion, of the Reformed Dutch Church, and so continued till the last. He was an eager and lifelong student, and of such versatility, that no subject repelled him. He delighted in working out problems in the higher mathematics, and was enthusiastic in the study of astronomy and music. But his preference was for linguistics and philosophy. He was at home not only in Latin and Greek literature, but in the Semitic languages, being more familiar with Arabic than any other scholar in America.

Being early accustomed to the use of the pen, he poured forth during forty years a constant stream of articles in newspapers, magazines, and reviews, touching every theme which interests the Christian, the patriot, or the scholar; and in no case could the treatment be said to be careless or superficial. Although he wrote so much, he wrote nothing that was not worth reading. His larger publications were Plato contra Atheos (in Greek, being the tenth book of the Dialogue on Laws, with luminous notes and discussions), New York, 1844; The Six Days of Creation, Schenectady, 1855 (new edition, London, 1869); The Bible and Science, Schenectady, 1856; The Divine Human in the Scriptures, New York, 1860; State Rights, a Photograph from the Ruins of Ancient Greece, 1862; additions to the Notes on Genesis in Lange's Bibel-Werk, edited by Dr. Schaff, New York, 1865; Metrical Version of Ecclesiastes, with Notes, in Schaff's Lange, 1870; Metrical Version of Job, with Notes, in same, 1874; The Light by which we see Light; or, Nature and the Scriptures (Vedder Lectures), 1875. Dr. Lewis had nearly every quality requisite for the successful handling of the subjects he took up. He had a keen and subtle intellect, a fertile imagination, and a quick perception of recondite relations. His style was fresh, incisive, and eloquent. His vast learning never overpowered his native force, but simply furnished the materials for comparison and illustration.

T. W. CHAMBERS.
doctrines in its traditional form, — De certate fidei Romana (1564), De quattuor trium pontificorum, etc. (1682), Historia ecclesiae Africana (1690); and from that stand-point he wrote polemically against Balthasar Becker, the Coccejans, the Cartesian philosophy, Herman Witsius, and others. His works against the Coccejans — Fäx veritatis (1677), Via veritatis (1679), and Synopsis contro-coccejana (1684) — are still of interest to students of those times.

A. SCHWEIZER.

LEYDEN, John of. See Bockhold.

LEYSER, Polykarp, b. at Winnenden, Württemberg, March 18, 1552; d. at Dresden, Feb. 22, 1610. He studied theology at Tubingen; and was appointed pastor at Gellersdorf in Lower Austria in 1578. In 1577 he was called, as superintendent and professor of theology, to Wittgenberg, where the Crypto-Calvinists had been overthrown in 1574. They gained the ascendancy again, however; and in 1587 Leyser removed as a heretic. Meanwhile the attention had been drawn to the curious book, and in 1680 the Jesuit Garnier published it in Paris. Other editions were made by Mabilon, in his Museum Italicum, by G. HOFFMANN, in his Nova collectio scriptor, et monumentorum. (Leipzig, 1739), by RIEGGER (Vienna, 1782), and finally, fully satisfactory in scientific respect, by Rozier (Liber diurnus, ou recueil des formules usitées par la chancellerie pontificale du V. au XI. siècle, Paris, 1869). Later collections, from the period between John XXII. and Gregory XIII., and collections of formulas for the use of bishops and abbots, exist in manuscript and printed form.

LIBER PONTIFICIALIS (in the older manuscript also called Qeasta Pontificum Romanorum, or Qeasta Summorum Pontificum, or Liber Gessorum Pontificalium) is a history of the bishops of Rome from the apostle Peter down to the second half of the ninth century. Following Omero Panvini, the first editors considered Anastasius (abbot of a monastery in Rome, librarian to the Church of Rome during the reign of Nicholas I., 858-867, and translator of several Greek works on church history) to be the author of the whole book; but later investigations have proved this supposition untenable. Differences, both formal and material, between the various biographies, show that the book must be the work of more than one writer; and this view is still further corroborated by the circumstance that passages of the Liber pontificalis are found quoted before the time of Anastasius. A more correct conception of the origin of the work was developed in the latter part of the seventeenth century, and set forth by E. von Schelstrate, librarian of the Vatican, in his Disseratio de antiquis Romanorum Pontificum catalogia (Rome, 1692), by Joannes Ciampini (Magister Brevium Gratiae), in his Ermen libri pontificia (Rome, 1888), and by Franc. Bianchini, in the preface to his edition of the Liber pontificalis. (See Muratori: Rerum Italicarum Scriptores, iii. 1, 83, 55.) Further results were gained, partly by the examination of manuscripts which were made in behalf of the new edition of the book in Pertz: Monumenta Germaniae (comp. Lipsius: Chronologia der römischen Bischöfe bis zur Mitte des 4. Jahrhunderts, Kiel, 1869), partly by the studies of L. DUCHESNE, also preparatory to a new edition (Étude sur le Liber pontificalis, Paris, 1877). (See G. WAIZE: Uber die verschiedene Texte des Liber pontificalis, in Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie, 1879; and DUCHESNE: La date et les recensions du L. p., in Revue des questions historiques, 1879.)

The oldest of the sources still extant from which the Liber pontificalis has drawn its contents is a catalogue of popes compiled during the reign down to Liberius, and probably made up during his reign (352-366), since it does not mention his death. The original manuscript of
this catalogue is lost; but there exist three transcriptions of it, which have been published in *Origines de l'église Romaine, par les membres de la communauté de Solemes*, Paris, 1826, 1. (Comp. Mommsen: *Über den Chronographen vom Jahre 354*, in the *Memoirs of the Royal Scientific Society of Nantes*. Philolog.-Hist. Class I.) A second catalogue (*Catalogus Felicianianus*) reaches down to Felix IV., who died in 530. It was first published, as far as Sylvester, by Henschen and Papebroch, in the *Prolegomena* to the first volume of *Acta Sanctorum April.*, not after the original manuscript, which is lost, but after a transcript presented by Queen Christine of Sweden to the Vatican Library. It is also found in the above-mentioned *Origines de l'église Romaine*. A third catalogue, finally (*Catalogus Cononianus*), reaches down to Conon, 687. It was first discovered in the archives of the cathedral of Ravenna, and published by Bianchini, i. e., vol. iv. But, beyond the latter part of the seventh century, none of the existing catalogues reaches; and it is evident, from a comparison of the manuscripts, that those earlier catalogues which form the basis of the *Liber pontificalis* have not come to us in their original form, but have been subjected to many kinds of additions and alterations.

The notices which the *Liber pontificalis* gives of each pope are at first very spare; but, after Sylvester, they become more ample, and give much information concerning the single churches of Rome and their property, concerning liturgy, archæology, etc.; drawing materials, not only from the catalogues, but also from the ecclesiastical archives, the acts of those popes who were venerated as martyrs, lists of papal decrees, buildings, grants, etc. From the close of the *Catalogus Cononianus*, the various manuscripts—that of Lucca, that of Milan, etc.—continue with various modifications; and it is evident that Anastasius Bibliothecarius is simply one of the continuators. Schelstrate even thinks that only the biography of Nicholas I. can with certainty be ascribed to him. As the first edition of the *Liber pontificalis*, Schelstrate designates the *Concilii*, by F. Crabbe, Cologne, 1538; but that work gives only extracts. The real *edicto princeps* is that by Buseus, Mayence, 1602. Continuations beyond the second half of the ninth century also exist, though not as parts of the *Liber pontificalis*. One stops at Gregory VI.; another (Codex Vaticanus) gives notices about the popes of the eleventh and twelfth centuries; a third treats the period from Leo IX. to Honorius II.; a fourth (*Acta Vatican*) stops at Alexander III.

**Liber Sextus.** See Canon Law.

**Liberia**, a negro republic in Western Africa, founded in 1820 by the American Colonization Society, declared independent Aug. 24, 1847, and at present in treaty relations with all the great powers of the world. It has a coast-line of nearly six hundred miles, and extends inwards toward the heart of the continent to an average distance of three hundred miles. The territory has been secured at different times by purchase. The colony owed its origin to the philanthropic impulses of the American Colonization Society to provide a home in their native country for American negroes. The idea of sending negro mission-aries to Africa, and associating a colony with them, occurred first to Dr. Samuel Hopkins of Newport in 1773. He agitated the subject, and secured funds for the education of two negroes in Yale College. In 1815 Dr. Robert Finley, pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Basking Ridge, N.J., Rev. Samuel J. Mills, and others, combined in the thought of establishing a society for African colonization. The issue was the American Colonization Society, which was finally organized, with regularly elected officers, on Jan. 1, 1817. The same year it despatched the Rev. Samuel J. Mills and Rev. Mr. Burgess to explore the western coast of Africa and Sierra Leone, with reference to securing a tract suitable for the society's purposes. Mr. Mills died at sea on his return journey; but Mr. Burgess made a report, the first results of which were seen in the despatch of a colony of eighty-nine persons, on Jan. 21, 1820, from New York. It purchased Cape Mesurado, near the present city of Monrovia. In 1882 the colony numbered eighteen thousand civilized Africans, mostly of American origin, and an indefinite number, of a million or more, of half-barbarous natives. The government of Liberia is a republic, electing a President and Vice-President every two years, and a Legislature of two houses. The capital is Monrovia. A system of public schools is in vogue, with a central university, of which Dr. Blyden is now the president. Missions to Liberia began in 1821, with the arrival of Lot Cary and Colin Teage, and their families, who were sent out by the African Missionary Society, established in Richmond in 1815, and largely through the efforts of Cary. This man had purchased his own freedom from slavery, and, at the time of his departure for Africa, was pastor of a Baptist Church in Richmond of eight hundred members. The mission of the Methodist-Episcopal Church of the United States was commenced in 1883. In 1836 a conference was organized, which in 1882 was divided into four districts, with one foreign missionary, 21 native ordained preachers, 24 native local preachers, 1,383 communicants, and 20 Sunday schools. The Episcopal Church of the United States supports a mission, which in 1882 included one bishop (Dr. Penick), two white and six colored presbyters, six deacons and other helpers, 336 communicants, and ten day, five boarding, and seven Sunday schools. The mission of the Presbyterian Church of the United States, established in 1842, employed in 1882 three American missionaries and six helpers, and had 276 communicants, and 114 children in its day schools. In close connection with the mission are the churches of Gaboon and Corisco, with their seven American and five native preachers, and 374 communicants. See Stockwell: *The Republic of Liberia*, New York, 1868; and the Reports and Documents of the American Colonization Society.

**Liberius**, Bishop of Rome from May 22, 352, to Sept. 24, 366. As the successor of Julius, the stanch ally of Athanasius, he became for a moment the centre of the Arian controversy. Constantius, after his victory over Magnentius in 353, also possessed of the Western Empire, sided with the Eusebians, and sought to establish peace in the Church by sacrificing Athanasius, and abandoning the confession of Nicaea. Liberius, how-
ever, took a firm stand against him, and sent Bishop Vincentius of Capua, and Marcellus, to the imperial court at Arles, asking for an ecumenical council convened at Aquileia. But the emperor preferred to hold the council at his own residence, under the direct influence of the court; and at the synod of Arles the whole orthodox party, with the exception of Paulinus of Trèves, gave its assent to the verdict of the Oriental bishops against Athanasius. Paulinus was banished. A second time Liberius addressed the emperor, and sent Bishop Lucifer of Calaris, the priest Pancratius, and the deacon Hilarius, to impugn the subscription of Liberius to the condemnation of Athanasius was now peremptorily demanded, but he refused to give it. From fear of the strongly pronounced sympathy of the Romans, he was secretly arrested, and then banished to Beroea in Thrace. The deacon Felix was appointed bishop in his stead, and installed in spite of violent opposition. Two years later on, however, when Constantius visited Rome, and the Roman ladies petitioned him for the return of Liberius, he graciously granted the petition, adding that the bishop would return "a better man." And, indeed, a great change had taken place with Liberius during his exile. "Better instructed by the Oriental bishops," he laid a declaration before the emperor, that he now agreed in the condemnation of Athanasius; he supplicated the court theologians, Ursacius, Valens, and Germinius, as men of peace; he renewed communion with Epictetus and Auxentius, the most decided enemies of Athanasius, and asserted that the latter had long ago been excluded from communion with the Church of Rome, as the Roman presbytery could testify. Summoned before the synod of Sirmium (358), he entirely abandoned the cause of Athanasius, condemned the expression *amour* of the Romans, and denounced the deacons who promoted it. Felix was restored to his bishopric, and Liberius was allowed to return to Rome, where, according to the arrangement of the emperor and the synod, he and Felix should reign in common. But the Bishops of the Semi-Arians, took advantage of the weakness of Liberius, and after Felix died, they obtained a cordial acknowledgment of communion from Butzer; but when, in Geneva, they solicited a similar favor from Calvin, they suddenly struck a rock. In 1534 Calvin met with Quintin in Paris at a public disputation, and pursued him hotly. Later on he became thoroughly acquainted with Poquoy in Geneva; and in 1545 he completely unmasked the party by his *Contre la Secte phantastique et furieuse des Libertins,* which in 1547 was followed by the *Épitre contre un certain cordelier supposé de la secte des Libertins.* After that the sect dissolved, but the *Ordinances Ecclesiastiques* came into operation, and the moral reforms were carried through with great severity, turned around against Calvin, bit-
terly complaining of the new tyranny. It is possible, though it cannot be proved, that they were directly influenced by the Libertines II. See Staehelin: Caledo, i, pp. 382 sqq. Trecschel.

LIBERTY. Religious. Religious liberty consists in the right guaranteed by the laws of a country to each one of its citizens to maintain and propagate any religious opinion, and to celebrate any form of worship, he may think proper, provided those opinions and that worship do not conflict with the fundamental ideas upon which the civil community is based. It includes protection of worship, and of property devoted to religious purposes, and recognizes the principle of religious association. It has been called a natural right, but a man can have no natural rights in opposition to his social duties. In its principle it is only an extension of the maxim of the Roman Code, Sic utere tuo ut non alienum laedas.

The latest authority on this subject, that of the Supreme Court of the United States (Reynolds vs. the United States, 98 Sup. Co. Rep., the Mormon marriage case), thus lays down the general principle: "Laws are made for the government of actions; and, while they cannot interfere with more religious belief and opinions, they may with the practices. Suppose one religiously believed that human sacrifices were a necessary part of religious worship, would it be seriously contended that the civil government under which he lived could not interfere to prevent a sacrifice? To permit this would be to make the professed doctrines of religious worship, as he made it. Government could exist only in name under such circumstances."

The practice of religious toleration, based on the doctrine of religious liberty, is one of recent growth. It has been called "the noblest innovation of modern times." In primitive antiquity the laws of all communities, at least of the Aryan race, derived authority from two religious ideas: either these laws were supposed to come direct from the gods themselves, or they conformed to the customs of the ancestors of those who observed them. Religion was wholly tribal or ethnic. The family was the unit under which authority was manifested. The household divinities were a necessary part of religious worship, and the civil government under which he lived could not interfere to prevent a sacrifice. So in regard to the gods of the city, the ritual of their worship was prescribed solely by those who safety they watched, and whose independence was supposed to be dependent upon it. The Romans and the Greeks, in their early conquests at least, always measured the power of resistance of an invaded district by the supposed power of its city gods: hence, when they conquered, they destr-10ed the gods, and by that means destroyed the political existence of the city. Athens is best known for the establishment of religious opinions, especially among the educated classes, became more rational and comprehensive, yet the old beliefs in regard to the power of the divinities, both of the household and of the city, and the necessity of propitiating them by means of the ancient ritual, remained among the masses a very active principle of action, not only to the time of Christ, but for three hundred years afterwards. Whatever, during this time, may have been the private opinions of the governing class, all ancient writers show, that, in their conduct of affairs, it was found necessary to respect the popular superstitions in regard to the close relation between the observance of the rites of the primitive religion and the safety of the State. This must be borne in mind, so that we may understand why Christianity alone, of all the innumerable forms of religious belief and worship introduced into the not bound to be divided by the divisions by a blood tie, or, in other words, who had not a birthright therein, could offer sacrifice or acceptable worship, either to the gods of the particular family or tribe of which the civitas was composed, or to the divinities which guarded the civitas itself. All outside the community thus made up were strangers. They had not a common religion, and therefore they had no common civil rights. They were regarded, for the most part, as enemies, and were called by the Greeks Barbaroi, or Agiassai. In this respect there was a certain religious liberty with well-defined bounds. In regard to the worship of the household divinities there was no uniform rule nor common ritual. The father of the family was the only priest, and the family ritual or worship was such as he made it. The Pontiff of Rome, or the Archon of Athens, might, it is true, ascertain whether the father of a family performed the household religious rites; but they had no authority to modify them in the slightest degree. Suo quisque ritu sacrificia faciat was the absolute rule. So, in regard to the gods of the city, the ritual of their worship was prescribed solely by those who safety they watched, and whose independence was supposed to be dependent upon it. The Romans and the Greeks, in their early conquests at least, always measured the power of resistance of an invaded district by the supposed power of its city gods: hence, when they conquered, they destr-10ed the gods, and by that means destroyed the political existence of the city. Athens is best known for the establishment of religious opinions, especially among the educated classes, became more rational and comprehensive, yet the old beliefs in regard to the power of the divinities, both of the household and of the city, and the necessity of propitiating them by means of the ancient ritual, remained among the masses a very active principle of action, not only to the time of Christ, but for three hundred years afterwards. Whatever, during this time, may have been the private opinions of the governing class, all ancient writers show, that, in their conduct of affairs, it was found necessary to respect the popular superstitions in regard to the close relation between the observance of the rites of the primitive religion and the safety of the State. This must be borne in mind, so that we may understand why Christianity alone, of all the innumerable forms of religious belief and worship introduced into the not bound to be divided by the divisions by a blood tie, or, in other words, who had not a birthright therein, could offer sacrifice or acceptable worship, either to the gods of the particular family or tribe of which the civitas was composed, or to the divinities which guarded the civitas itself. All outside the community thus made up were strangers. They had not a common religion, and therefore they had no common civil rights. They were regarded, for the most part, as enemies, and were called by the Greeks Barbaroi, or Agiassai. In this respect there was a certain religious liberty with well-defined bounds. In regard to the worship of the household divinities there was no uniform rule nor common ritual. The father of the family was the only priest, and the family ritual or worship was such as he made it. The Pontiff of Rome, or the Archon of Athens, might, it is true, ascertain whether the father of a family performed the household religious rites; but they had no authority to modify them in the slightest degree. Suo quisque ritu sacrificia faciat was the absolute rule. So, in regard to the gods of the city, the ritual of their worship was prescribed solely by those who safety they watched, and whose independence was supposed to be dependent upon it. The Romans and the Greeks, in their early conquests at least, always measured the power of resistance of an invaded district by the supposed power of its city gods: hence, when they conquered, they destr-10ed the gods, and by that means destroyed the political existence of the city. Athens is best known for the establishment of religious opinions, especially among the educated classes, became more rational and comprehensive, yet the old beliefs in regard to the power of the divinities, both of the household and of the city, and the necessity of propitiating them by means of the ancient ritual, remained among the masses a very active principle of action, not only to the time of Christ, but for three hundred years afterwards. Whatever, during this time, may have been the private opinions of the governing class, all ancient writers show, that, in their conduct of affairs, it was found necessary to respect the popular superstitions in regard to the close relation between the observance of the rites of the primitive religion and the safety of the State. This must be borne in mind, so that we may understand why Christianity alone, of all the innumerable forms of religious belief and worship introduced into the not bound to be divided by the divisions by a blood tie, or, in other words, who had not a birthright therein, could offer sacrifice or acceptable worship, either to the gods of the particular family or tribe of which the civitas was composed, or to the divinities which
and Oriental sun-worshippers, are not found among its most active enemies, simply because the Roman traditions formed no part of their religious belief.

Christianity brought into the Roman world totally different ideas. It was not the domestic religion of any one family, nor the national religion of any city or race. The other religions had taught, with the unity of God, the unit of the human race: justice, and even kindness towards both strangers and enemies, formed the very basis of its system. Christianity was a universal religion, asserting not only supreme, but exclusive belief; mere disbelief having previously been, licew religionis dog/mate(leviare contendunl." Their

siastical crime of heresy. Heretics are defined as much to the novel claims of a religion which aimed to destroy the old gods, as to the revolt against the pure morality and lofty self-denial taught by the Christians.

The conflict between the two systems was inevitable; and it was not brought to a close, so far as the legal sanction of persecution was concerned, until A.D. 313, when the celebrated Edict of Toleration was issued at Milan by Constantine and Licinius. This has been called the "Magna Charta" of the liberties of Christianity; but, strictly, it gave only toleration to the worship of Christianity, asserting not only supreme, but exclusive religious belief.

The dispute, the meeting of the Council of Nicaea A.D. 325, and the adoption of the creed at that council, since known as the "Nicene Creed," form an epoch in the history of religious liberty. At this time were introduced into the Church two principles, which, whatever other results they may have produced, were the prolific sources, for many centuries, of persecution. The one was the absolute and to seek out and punish heretics by means of monks (the Dominicans), whose twofold duty was to instruct the people in the true doctrine, and to extirpate it, that, supported doubtless by the church opinion of Europe at the time, he established during the Albigensian crusade an order of monks (the Dominicans), whose twofold duty it was to instruct the people in the true doctrine, and to seek out and punish heretics by means of a tribunal called the "Inquisition," of which these monks were the judges, to the exclusion of the ancient and ordinary jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese. (See Inquisition.)

Vast as were the changes made by the Reformation, it did not introduce into any Protestant country in Europe the principle of religious liberty, or even of toleration. Dissenters from the religion established by law suffered from grievous civil disabilities in England and Scotland, in Germany, Holland, and Switzerland; while in Spain the Inquisition, the most terrible of its kind, was established during the civil wars of the sixteenth century and the policy of Louis XIV. during the seventeenth, were directed to the advancement of the orthodox belief by exterminating in those countries obstinate heretics. In England heresy was an offence punishable by death before the Reformation, and it continued to be so for one hundred and thirty-five years afterwards. It was not until 1677 that an act was passed (29 Car. ii.) abolishing the use of the writ De heretico comburendo by the civil authority. Two things, however, are to be noted: 1st. That, as time went on, penalties for heresy were not so strictly enforced as they had been; and, 2d. That penal laws against dissenters in England were maintained, not so much from zeal for orthodoxy as from a fear lest the Catholics should gain the control of the government. This is admirably illustrated by the terms of the "Act of Toleration," so-called, passed in 1689, from which it clearly appears, that, in the persecution of dissenters, political objects and motives had at that time usurped the place held by blind zeal for the Church in the
middle age. (See Macaulay's History of England, chap. xi., for an excellent illustration of this change.)

In Germany the Reformation was followed by wars between the Imperial Catholic authority and that of many of the rulers of different portions of the country who had long been practically independent of the emperor, and had become Lutheran Protestants. In these wars the principle contended for on both sides was 

_illius religio_. The question was, to which religion the people of Germany, for the purposes of religious legislation, belonged. This principle was settled at the Peace of Augsburg (1555), by giving to each prince the power of establishing within his own dominions his own religion. The Protestant dissenters from Lutheranism — that is, the Calvinists, Zwinglians, and Anabaptists — were not included in this peace, because no sovereign in Germany then held to the form of belief. By the Peace of Westphalia (1648), which closed the terrible Thirty-Years' War, free exercise of their religion, and civil rights, were accorded in each of the states of Germany to Catholics, as well as to Protestants, both Lutherans and Calvinists, but to no others.

Up to the period of the French Revolution, the principle established by the Peace of Westphalia, although it was never formally adopted by the other powers, gradually acquired throughout Europe almost the force of an international code. There were no more religious wars, and very little of the old forms of persecution of heresy: yet the civil disabilities of dissenters, Catholic or Protestant, as they happened to be, consisting generally in exclusion from public office and employment, were everywhere jealously maintained.

Since the French Revolution there has been throughout Europe a vast change in opinion, not only as to the true relation of religion to government, but also as to the policy of the exclusion of any one from public employment in consequence of his religious belief. In England, one after another of the old strongholds of intolerance has fallen, until the Catholic, the Protestant dissenters, and even the Quakers, have become so far footing of perfect equality with the members of the Established Church, so far as their political and civil rights, and their admission to public office, are concerned. In France, this principle of equality has been carried so far, that each form of religious belief is supported from the funds of the State. Even in Spain and in Italy, Protestant sects are now permitted to worship publicly, and their church property is secured to them. Denmark and Sweden still require that all public officers shall conform to the established Lutheran religion. The general tendency at present is towards the absolute separation of the exercise of religious liberty from the restraint of State legislation. The ideal seems now to be a "free Church in a free State;" the two spheres being kept as wholly distinct from each other as the general well being will permit. The present attitude of Germany towards the Catholic Church is thought by many not to be in the direction of modern thought and modern practice in this matter. Shocked by the decree of the Vatican Council of 1870, declaring the infallibility of the Pope, and by the condemnation of the most deeply cherished principles of modern society as errors, by the syllabus of 1864, the Prussian Government adopted in 1873 a series of laws known as the "Falk Laws." By these laws it is provided, among other things, that no man shall be allowed to become a minister of worship in Prussia, unless he shall receive his education in a public school and state university. Ecclesiastical discipline, where it involves fine, imprisonment, or corporal punishment, is made subject, also, to revision on an appeal to judges appointed by the State.

The English sectaries who founded colonies on this continent brought with them a no larger spirit of toleration than they had professed at home. They came, as Bancroft says, "to plant a church in the wilderness." Dissent from the doctrines and worship of that church was punished, in all but one of the New-England Colonies, as hereby; while in Pennsylvania no man could hold office who did not acknowledge the divinity of Christ; and in Maryland, as early as 1659, Quakers were fined, and otherwise punished, because they conscientiously refused to bear arms in the service of the Colony. But the principle of perfect toleration grew rapidly in this country, side by side, strange to say, with a practice, which had become almost universal at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, of encouraging, in various ways, the maintenance of Christianity, so far as it was possible to do so without infringing the rights of conscience and the freedom of religious worship. The Constitution provides that "no religious test shall be required as a qualification for office;" and the very first amendment to that instrument which was demanded by public opinion in order to set at rest forever the relations of the national government to religion, was in these words: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This is one of the very few provisions of the Constitution which no one has ever sought to change; and its adoption forms, not only an epoch in the history of religious liberty, but an example, also, which, during the last one hundred years, all civilized nations have striven to imitate.


_LIBRARI CAROLINI. See CAROLINE BOOKS._

/LICENSE._ applied to preaching, means the right to preach, given by a regularly constituted body, such as a presbytery, a conference, or a council. The candidate is examined upon his theological studies, and, if thought worthy, is licensed to preach as an accredited teacher of the denomination. But there is no practice which dispenses the sacraments, nor to sit as member of an ecclesiastical court: these are consequent upon ordination. In the Church of England and the Episcopal Church of the United States, the word "license" is applied to the permission to preach.
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given by a bishop to a deacon, or to read sermons
given to a candidate.

LICHFIELD, the seat of the episcopal see of that
name, is a city of 8,300 inhabitants (1861), sixteen
miles north of Birmingham, Staffordshire. Eng.
The name is taken to mean “field of the dead,” and
to have been given to the locality in consequence of
the massacre there, in the reign of Diocletian (A.D.
305), of several hundred Christians. Lichfield
Cathedral is in the early English style, is about
hundred and three feet long, dates from the twelfth
century, and has recently been extensively re-
stored. The see dates from 680. St. Chad was
its first bishop. From 785, in the reign of Offa,
to 799, it was made an archbishopric; in 1078 the
see was removed to Chester, and again to Covent-
try in 1102, but restored to Lichfield in 1129.
Lichfield was made a city by Edward VI. in 1549.
The famous Dr. Samuel Johnson was born there
Sept. 18, 1709. The episcopal stipend is forty-
five hundred pounds. See W. BERESEFORD: Lich-
field, London, 1883.

LIEBNER, Karl Theodor Albert, a distin-
guished evangelical theologian, and preacher of the
Lutheran Church of Germany; b. March 3, 1806, in
Schkolen, near Naumberg; d. June 24, 1871, in
apoplexy, in Switzerland. He entered the univer-
sity of Leipzig, where he spent four years, then
passed to Berlin, and from there to the seminary
at Wittenberg, and was appointed by the Prussian
ministry of education to arrange the Wittenberg
library, and during his residence in that city put
forth his first important work, on Hugo de St.
Victor and the theological tendencies of his day
(Hugo von St. Victor und d. theol. Richtungen seiner
Zeit, 1831). This work was received very kindly
by the theological public; and its author was called
in 1832 to the church in Kreisfeld, near Eisleben.
In 1835 he accepted an invitation from Göttingen
to become the successor of Julius Muller, as pro-
fessor of theology, and university preacher. Two
of the results of his study there were a volume of
sermons (1841, 3d ed., 1855), which Palmer, Baur,
and others characterized as models, and another
on Richard de St. Victor (Rich. a St. Victor de
contemplatione doctrina). Refusing a call to Mar-
burg, he became Dorner's successor in the chair of
theology in Halle. Here Liebner published his
system of theology (D. christl. Dogmatik aus dem
christologischen Prinzip dargestellt, 1819). Mücke,
in his Dogmatik des 19. Jahrhunderts, places this
work at the side of Dorner's.
The calls to Heidelberg and other universities,
which this volume secured for him, Liebner de-
clined in favor of an invitation to a professorship
in Leipzig in 1851, where he soon added the duties
of university preacher to those of professor. In
1855 he made his last change, going to Dresden
in the capacity of first court-preacher, and vice-
 presidents of the Supreme Church Council, where
he continued to labor, in spite of calls to Berlin
(1861) and Göttingen (1862). Amongst his other
published works were two volumes of sermons
(Dresden, 1864).

LIGHTFOOT, John, one of the greatest He-
brew scholars in history; b. at Stoke-upon-Trent,
Staffordshire, April 18, 1662; d. at Hales, Shrop-
shire, Sept. 6, 1675. He was educated at Christ's College,
Cambridge, where he greatly distinguished himself
by his oratory and classical attainments, but where
he learned no Hebrew. On taking his bachelor's
degree (1621), he became assistant master at Rept-
ton, Derbyshire. Two years afterwards he was
ordained, and obtained the curacy at Norton-under-
Hales, Shropshire. There Sir Rowland Cotton
heard him preach, and thus he became a domestic
chaplain at Bellaport, Sir Rowland's home. His
patron was an amateur Hebraist of some attain-
ments; while he, the chaplain, knew nothing of
the language. Shame at this state of things fair-
ly drove him to study Hebrew; and so zealous was
his toil, and so great aptitude did he evince, that
he quickly made himself the greatest Hebraist in
England, and was only excelled in Europe by the
younger Buxtorf. For some reason he ultimately
left his patron, and was for two years in a charge
at Stone in Staffordshire; then, for the sake of
nearness to Sion College, London, he removed to
Hornsey, and in 1629 published his first work.
In 1630 Sir Rowland Cotton presented him to
the rectory of Ashley, Staffordshire. In 1642 he
left it for London, where he became minister of
St. Bartholomew's. He sat in the Savoy Confer-
ce, 1661, but conformed, 1662. In 1675 he
was twice married, and had six children by his
first wife.

Lightfoot enjoys to-day a universal fame. Much
of his laborious writing is now antiquated, much,
indeed, useless; but enough remains of useful
matter to make his books imperishable. Few
Christian scholars now study the Talmud; and all
are satisfied that Lightfoot, Selden, and the others
have ransacked that great garret, and brought all
its valuables to light. Lightfoot's repute as a
scholar has overshadowed his other titles to fame;
so that his contemporaneous reputation for eloquence,
 fidelity, and spirituality, for his ardent defence of
Erastianism, and for his many admirable qualities
in private life, which rendered him a beloved pas-
tor and friend, has been well-nigh forgotten.

His principal works appeared in the following
order, Erubbin, or Miscellanies, Christian and Ju-
dicial, and others; penned for recreation at vacant
hours, London, 1629; A few and new Observations
upon the Book of Genesis; he published two volumes
of them, certain; the rest, probable; all, harmless, strange, and rarely
heard of before, 1642; A Handful of Gleanings out
of the Book of Exodus, 1643; The Harmony of the
Four Evangelists among themselves, and with the Old Testament; with an explanation of the chiefest difficulties both in language and sense. Part I. from the beginning of the Gospel of St. John to the baptism of our Saviour; 1644. Part II. from the baptism of our Saviour to the first Passover after; 1647. Part III. from the first Passover after our Saviour's baptism to the second; 1650 (so this laborious work remains unfinished); A Commentary upon the Acts of the Apostles, Chronical and Critical; the Difficulties of the Text explained, and the Times of the story cast into Annals. From the beginning of the Book to the end of the Twelfth Chapter. With a brief Survey of the contemporary Story of the Jews and Romans (down to A.D. 44), 1645; The Harmony, Chronical, and Order of the Old Testament, 1647; The Harmony, Chronical, and Order of the New Testament, 1555; The Temple, especially as it stood in the Days of our Saviour, 1650; but the work by which he immortalized himself was, Horae Hebraica; et Talmutica; Hebrew and Talmudical excursions upon Matthew, 1638, Mark, 1639, Luke, 1674, John, 1671, Acts, and some few chapters of Romans, 1670, and First Corinthians, 1684. This last work appeared first in Latin, and was reprinted in Leipzig under the editorial care of Carpzov, 1675—79, 2 vols., but has been translated into English, and in this language is found in vols. xi.—xii. of the Pitman edition mentioned below, also separately, edited by R. Gandel, Oxford, 1859, 4 vols. Lightfoot's Works have been four times published, first, edited by Bright and Strype, London, 1684, 2 vols. folio, second, by Texelius, Rotterdam, 1686, 2 vols. folio, third (first 2 vols., reprint of the second), edited by J. Leuden, Franeker; 1699, 3 vols. folio, fourth and by far the best edition, by J. R. Pitman, London, 1822—25, 13 vols. 8vo. This last edition incorporates the volume of Remains, 1700, contains a Life by the editor, and the emendations of former editions.

LIGHTS. The Ceremonial Use of, in the Christian service, is of very old date. In spite, however, of the "many lights" of the "upper chamber" at Troas (Acts xx. 8), the Christian custom does not seem to be a simple continuation of a similar Jewish custom; nor is it likely that the Christians first adopted the practice from Paganism: on the contrary, Tertullian and other Fathers often ridicule the heathens for their superstitious and idolatrous use of lights at daytime. When, in the beginning of the fourth century, the custom became a generally adopted part of the Christian ritual,—such as it appears, according to Vigilantius, who attacked it, and according to Jerome, who excused it, if he did not defend it,—it looks most like a reminiscence from a former period of the history of the Church, when it had been, not a sacred rite, but a practical necessity. In the first three centuries the Christians were often, not to say always, compelled to worship in secrecy, in the darkness of night, or in some hidden place; as, for instance, during the persecution of Diocletian. Under such circumstances, lights—candles or lamps—were indispensable. But what are the so-called "gospel-lights," which are first spoken of by Jerome in 378?—the bishop entering the church preceded by seven ceroferarii, each of them carrying a lighted taper (candela); and, and two of them taking up their position beside the ambo, while the gospel is read aloud,—what are those lights but a reminiscence from the catacombs? And the same may be said of the paschal lights, the baptismal lights, etc., only that, in each individual case, the custom has its own explanation of its own. Especially at funerals, lights of all kinds were profusely used throughout Christendom. Innumerable candles on golden stands were lighted all around the body of Constantine when it lay in state. When the remains of Chrysostom were brought to Constantinople from Comana, the waters of the Bosphorus were covered with the lamps of the faithful. When Queen Radegund was buried at Poictiers, all the free-women of the country stood around the grave with lighted tapers in their hands. From such customs the transition was very easy to keeping the lights always lighted in the sepulchre, or before the relic and the image, and to presenting them as a sacrifice to the saint. But, with the Reformation, the whole custom, in all its various forms, was completely broken up; only one small remnant of it, the Eucharistic light, still remaining in the Lutheran churches and in the Church of England. The injunction of Edward VI., of 1547, allowed two lights to be lighted on the high altar during the celebration of the Lord's Supper, to signify that Christ is the true light of the world.

LIGUORI, Alfonso Maria da, the most popular and influential author of devotional works and ethical theologian in the Roman-Catholic Church of the last century; b. Sept. 27, 1696, at Marianella, a suburb of Naples; d. at Nocera, Aug. 1, 1787. His parents were of noble antecedents and pious inclinations; his father, an officer in the Neapolitan army. He was educated by the priests of the oratory of Philip Neri; studied law, and took his doctor's degree in his seventeenth year. The loss of a case determined him to enter the church, and he was consecrated priest in 1726. He became an earnest preacher, and devoted much time to the relief of the poor. In 1731, while in Poggia, Apulia, he had the first of his visions. As he was kneeling before a picture of the Virgin, she appeared to him in all her beauty. During a sojourn at Scala, where he was holding religious services with the nuns, one of the sisters, Maria Celeste Costarosa, revealed to him the confessional that the Saviour had chosen him to organize a new ecclesiastical order. Following this revelation, he founded in 1732 the Congregation of our Most Blessed Redeemer. (See Redemptorists.) The Cardinal Archbishop of Naples disapproved of the movement, which also met with opposition from other quarters. But the order grew; and in 1742 Liguori was chosen general superior (rector major) for life, and the order was approved in 1749 by a papal brief. In 1762 Liguori was elevated, against his will, by Clement XIII., to the bishopric of St. Agatha of the Goths in Naples, from which, in 1775, he was allowed to retire, at his own request, by Pius VI. He retired to a house of the Redemptorists at Nocera. His latter years were blighted by physical sufferings, and a division in his order in consequence of a breach between the Pope and the Neapolitan administration. Nine years after his death, he was pronounced Venerable by Pius VIII. in 1816; and on May 26, 1830, was canonized by Gregory XVI. Pius IX. added, July 7, 1871, to these
honor the dignity of Doctor of the Church; thus
placing him beside Thomas Aquinas, Bernard of
Clairvaux, etc. The decree was based upon the
"scholarly and devotional character" of his works,
and especially the circumstance that "they teach
in the most excellent manner the truths relating to
the immaculate conception of the blessed
mother of God, and the infallibility of the Roman
church, and should be used in schools, colleges,
controversies, sermons, etc., as well as in pri-
vate."

No complete edition of Liguori's writings has
been published. The most of them appeared in
Italian, at Naples and Bassano, and have been
translated into Latin, French, German, and other
languages. His more important works are, Theo-
logia Moralis, Naples, 1755, 2 vols., with additions,
Bologna, 1763, 5 vols.; History and Refutation of the
Heretics, Venice, 1772, 2 vols.; The Truth of the
Faith, or Refutation of the Materialists, Deists,
and Sectaries, Venice, 1761, 2 vols.; La vera sposa di
Gesù Cristo, Venice, 1781, 2 vols., last ed., Naples,
1876; Le glorie di Maria, Venice, 1784, 2 vols., last
ed., Rome, 1878; [Eng. trans., The Glories of Mary,
New York, 3d ed., 1852. The last is the best
known of Liguori's works. It breathes an intense
devotion to Mary, and indulges in the most ex-
aggerated praises of her beauty, moral innocence,
power of representing the sinner's cause to the
Saviour, if not directly of saving him. "Mary is
truly our mother, not according to the flesh,
but the spiritual mother of our souls and of our
salvation." (vi. 1). "She is omnipotent ... because
she obtains in her prayers whatever she wishes"
(vi. 1). "I invoke thy aid, 0 my great advocate,
my refuge, my hope, my mother Mary! To thy
hands I commit the cause of my eternal salvation.
To thee I consign my soul. It was lost, but thou
must save it," etc. (vi. 3). These passages fairly
represent the exaggerated Mariolatry of the work,
and the distance to which the sinner is removed
from Christ. Mary is addressed as the "refuge
of sinners," "our life and hope," "queen of angels,"
"queen of heaven," "queen of the whole
world," "queen of mercy, as Christ is King of
justice," etc. Well might Keble exclaim, when
the decree of the Immaculate Conception was
promulgated in 1854, that it made the ecclesiastical
union of Christendom impossible so long as it
continued to be enforced. Liguori appeals to
ecclesiastical writers, especially John of Damasc-
cus, Peter Damiani, and Abelard. His quotations
from Scripture are confined almost entirely to
the Song of Solomon, the Shulamite of which
he looks upon as the type of Mary, and the
apocryphal book Ecclesiasticus.]

Lit. — Lives of Liguori by GIANI, Rome, 1815;
JEANGARD (French), Louvain, 1829, 1st
FOLI, Naples, 1834. [English biographies, edited
by F. W. Faber, London, 1848-49, 4 vols., and
by one of the Redemptorist Fathers, Baltimore,
1855. English translation of his Reflections on
Spiritual Subjects and on the Passion of Jesus Christ,
Leiden, 1849, and of his Novena in Honor of St.
Theresa, Baltimore, 1882. A second edition of his
Theologia Moralis, edited by J. Ninzatti, appeared
in Vienna, 1882, in 2 vols. See also MEYRICK:

Moral and Devotional Theology of the Church
of Rome, according to the Teaching of S. Alfonso da
Liguori. London, 1857.]

ZÖCKLER.

LIGURE, one of the stones in the breastplate
of the high priest (Exod. xxviii. 19), perhaps the
tourmaline or rubellite; but the rendering is
very uncertain.

LILLIE, John, D.D., b. at Kelso, Scotland, Dec.
16, 1812; d. at Kingston, N. Y., Feb. 23, 1887.
He was graduated with the first honors at the
University of Edinburgh, 1831; studied theology,
and taught, until 1834, when he emigrated to
America. He then finished his theological studies
at New Brunswick, and was ordained, and in-
stalled minister of the Reformed Dutch Church at
Kingston, N. Y., where he labored ably and faith-
fully until August, 1841, when he accepted the
presidency of the grammar-school of the Univer-
sity of the City of New York. From 1843 to
1858 he had charge of the Broadway, afterward
Stanton-street, Dutch Church, and, in addition,
edited the Jewish Chronicle on behalf of missions
among the Jews from 1844 to 1848. From 1851
to 1857 he labored upon the Revised Version of
the American Bible Union; but in the latter year
he re-entered the pastorate, being installed over
the Presbyterian Church of Kingston, N. Y., and
in that relation he died after a four-days' illness.
Dr. Lillie was acknowledged to be one of the
best biblical scholars in the United States. He
has left permanent evidence of his learning, not
only in his individual publications, but in the
new versions and philological commentaries upon
Thessalonians, John's Epistles, 2 Peter, Jude, and
in that relation he died after a four-days' illness.
Dr. Lillie was acknowledged to be one of the
best biblical scholars in the United States. He
has left permanent evidence of his learning, not
only in his individual publications, but in the
new versions and philological commentaries upon
Thessalonians, John's Epistles, 2 Peter, Jude, and
Revolution (also on 1 Peter and James; but
these were never printed), prepared for the Ameri-
can Bible Union. He was a spiritually minded
and edifying preacher and a faithful pastor. His
works, all printed in New York, were, Perpetuity
of the Earth (1842), Lectures on the Epistles to
the Thessalonians (1840), Translation, with additions,
of Auberlen and Riggenbach upon Thessalonians
(in the Lange Series, 1868), also posthumous Le-
cures on the First and Second Epistles of Peter,
with a Biographical Sketch by Dr. Schaff and James
Inglis (1869).

LILY. The only true lily now found in Pales-
tine is the scarlet martagon; but it is likely, that
by the term in Scripture is meant the scarlet
anemone, which in color and abundance fills the
requirements (Cant. v. 13; Matt. vi. 28-30).
But, as the Arabs now use the word of many
flowers, it may be that in Scripture similar laxity
prevails.

LIMBORCH, Philipp van, b. in Amsterdam,
June 10, 1833; d. there April 13, 1712. He
studied theology, philosophy, philology, and ma-
thematics in his native city, Leyden, and Utrecht,
and was appointed pastor at Gouda in 1657, pas-
tor in Amsterdam in 1667, and in the next year
professor of theology at the Remonstrant colleges
in Amsterdam. What Episcopius began, and
Curellius continued, he completed. His Institu-
tions Theologiae Christianae (1688) was trans-
Prominent among his other works are De Veritate
Religiones Christianae (1692), and Historiae
Christianae (1699), translated into English by Samuel
Chandler, London, 1731. See A. DES ARMORIE
VAN DER HOVEN DE J. Clerico et P. a Limborch,
LINBUS, or LIMBO. The Roman-Catholic Church fixes the eternal end of human life in a double existence in heaven and hell, and so far she is in full accord with the Greek and Protestant churches; but, in her farther development of these fundamental ideas, she pursues a course of her own. The Roman Catholic Church teaches that there are a hell, in which infidels and such as die in a state of reprobation are shut up forever under unspeakable sufferings; a purgatory, in which the souls of the faithful go through a certain amount of pain in order to be thoroughly purified from sin; and, finally, a third place,—the bosom of Abraham, or, as it is generally called in common ecclesiastical parlance, the limbus patrum,—in which the pre-Christian saints, the saints of the Old Testament, were retained in an intermediate state between blessedness and punishment until the descent of Christ into Hades. To these three adeitas receptacula taught by the symbolical books of the Church, her theologians, the schoolmen, have added a fourth one for children who die without baptism,—the limbus infantum. The chronology of the infernal region then becomes as follows: in the centre of the earth, hell; in the sphere around hell, purgatory; in the sphere around purgatory, limbus infantum; and then, somewhere between heaven and hell, the bosom of Abraham. With respect to the detailed description of these localities, most poets and theologians agree as to the first, second, and fourth; while the third, the limbus infantum, has given rise to very diverse opinions. See the art. on INFANT SALVATION. The word limbus is Latin, means "border," and was probably first employed by Thomas Aquinas, who rapidly brought it into common use.

LINGARD, John, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S., Roman Catholic historian, b. at Winchester, Feb. 5, 1771; d. at Hornby, near Lancaster, July 13, 1851. He studied at the English College, Douai, France, from 1782 to 1793; but, anticipating the breaking-up of the college in the spring of that year, went to England as tutor in the family of Lord Stourton, and remained in this capacity until, in October, 1794, he went to Crook Hall, near Durham, where some of those driven from Douai had gathered, and completed his theological studies. He was ordained priest in 1795; and, having declined a flattering call to London, taught natural and moral philosophy in Crook Hall, and was vice-president and chaplain of the college. In 1808 the college was removed to Ushaw, Durham, and he accompanied it, and in 1810 was chosen president; but in 1811 he retired to Hornby, a very small charge, in order that he might give himself up to historical studies undistracted. Where he spent, 150 life in 1480; in 1817 he visited Rome, partly on business connected with the English college, and partly to study in the Vatican Library; again, he was there...
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in 1821, and was received with great distinction. The Pope, Pius VII., conferred upon him the degrees of doctor of divinity and doctor of laws. In 1824 he was made a fellow of the Royal Society. In 1825 Leo XII. offered him a cardinal's hat; but he declined, preferring, characteristically, quiet and study, to cares and authority. For some little time prior to his death he received a pension from the government, of three hundred pounds. Lingard was an "able and intense" Roman Catholic, ever ready to defend his church. His principal controversial writings will be found collected under the title, A Collection of Tracts, or Several Subjects connected with the Civil and Religious Principles of Catholics (London, 1820): besides these may be mentioned his oft-published Catechetical Instructions on the Doctrines and Worship of the Catholic Church (1840), and his scholarly New Version of the Four Gospels (1836). But it is as an historical writer that he lives. He wrote, The Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church, 1806 (3d ed. greatly enlarged, under the title, The History and Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church, 1845), and the widely great London from the First Invasion by the Romans to the Commencement of the Reign of William III., London, 1819-30, 8 vols.; 5th and best ed., revised thoroughly by the author, 1849, 10 vols.; 6th ed. (reprint), 1854-55. It has been translated into German, French, and Italian. It should always be consulted for the Roman-Catholic view of its period, but cannot be relied upon implicitly; for the author keeps back, sometimes, part of the truth. (Compare Adams: Manual of Historical Literature, pp. 440, 441.) A Life of Lingard is prefixed to the sixth edition of his history.

LINUS is, by all lists of Roman bishops, placed as the immediate successor of St. Peter (Irenæus: Adv. omm. haer., III., 3, 3; Catalogus Liberr. ed. Mommsen, in his Uber den Chronographen von 364, Eusebius: Hist. Eclt., III., 2, 13, and Chronicile, p. 166, ed. Schöne; Augustine: Epist. 53; Ortaurus: De schiz. Dom. II., 13. The length of his reign is differently determined. Eusebius counts twelve years in his church history, but fourteen in his chronicle; the Catalogus Liberr. counts twelve years, four months, and twelve days; Jerome, eleven years. The date of the beginning of his reign is also differently fixed according to the different calculations of the death of St. Peter. As the Roman congregation knew nothing about an episcopal constitution in the beginning of the second century, Linus was consequently simply a presbyter of the church; but when it afterwards became of interest to present a continuous succession of bishops from the apostle Peter, he was made a bishop, and identified with the Linus of 2 Tim. iv. 21. His alleged epitaph has no interest whatever (comp. Kraus: Roma soterea, 2d ed., p. 69). See Lipsius: Chronologie d. römischen Bischöfe, Kiel, 1889, p. 116. — Hauern.

LINZ, The Peace of. This was concluded Dec. 13, 1645, between Georg Rakoczy, Prince of Transylvania, and the Emperor Ferdinand III. as King of Hungary, and forms the foundation of the constitution of the evangelical church in Hungary. The Protestants obtained freedom of worship in a homily. Leo III. (theodore), who had taken from them were restored to them; and a punishment was fixed for any one who interferred with their service, or annoyed them on account of their religion.

LIONS of the Asiatic species, smaller, with a shorter mane, and less formidable carnivores, were found in Palestine down to the twelfth century, but have disappeared, together with the forests. Towns derived their names from the lion, e.g., Ariel and Laish; while Lebাগুোথ means "lioness." The lion's favorite abode seems to have been in the jungles of the Jordan (Deut. xii. 20, 1. 44). It was sometimes attacked by the shepherds single-handed (1 Sam. xvii. 36); but generally it was itself the attacking party, devoured men, and even ravaged villages. How deep an impression the Hebrews had received from this animal, the "king of beasts," may be judged, not only from the characteristic descriptions which the Bible contains of its habits and appearance, its roar and movements, but also from the innumerable symbolical and metaphorical expressions derived from it (Gen. xii. 9; 1 Chron. xii. 8; Isa. xxix. 1, marg.; Rev. v. 5).

LITANIES. See LITURGIES.

LITANY (Latinus). The term originally meant a prayer for protection (comp. λισσομα), but later was used of the processions in which such prayers were offered (comp. Sophokles, Glossary of later and Byzantine Greek, in Memoirs of the American Academy, vii. 407), or of the Kyrie Eleison. Since the Reformation, it is usually employed to designate a special form of prayer in which the minister announces the objects of petition, and the congregation responds with an appropriate supplicatory ejaculation. From old the ministerial announcement has been called the pro- phonesis. There are proofs, that, at a very early period, the congregation at public service not only gave the response "Amen" to the eucharistic prayers (Justin: Ap., i. 65; comp. Apost. Const., vii. 12), but also other responses in the general prayer of the church. When, for example, the prophoinesis for the emperor was recited, all responded, "Christ, help him." See Daniel: Cod. liturg., iv. 1, 71). The call to repeat a Kyrie Eleison ("Lord, have mercy upon us") first occurs in the special prayers for penitents (Ap. Const., vii. 8). In the so-called litanies of James and Mark,—the oldest of the Oriental litanies,—provision is made for responsive worship, as when the prayer was opened on the part of the minister with the words, "Let us all say, Kyrie Eleison." The other Oriental litanies, those of Chrysostom and Basil, the Armenian, etc., referred their responses to the deacon or the choir. The Greek expression, Kyrie Eleison, was introduced in the churches of the West by a decree of the Council of Vaison, in 529, at the side of the Latin Domine misere.me ("Lord, have mercy upon us"); and, by the rule of Benedict, Kyrie became another designation for litanies.

Mamertus, Archbishop of Vienne (460), influenced by earthquakes and other calamities, instituted rogationes, or processional litanies, for the three days preceding Ascension Day. The Council of Orleans (511) called these processional "litanies" (litania), and prescribed them for all Gaul. Avitus of Vienne (d. about 529) describes them in his life of St. Mamertus: Liturgia Rom., l. 78). Notices of these
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prayer, enter into thy closet," he also said, "After this manner pray ye, Our Father who art in heaven."

The last as clearly implies a social act as the first implies a solitary act; and, in enjoining the solitaries, the early church teachers should so far consult the practice of the apostolic churches, as to add also other forms, repeating the same prayers, for example, again and again, till they became fixed in the memory of the people, who thus learned when to ejaculate the "Amen" which had been handed down to them from the practice of the apostolic churches. In this way a simple but continually augmenting service of prayer would be growing up in the Church, varying in various parts, according to the taste and the devotional gifts of the several bishops. These would soon become so familiar, that the people would be able to join in every prayer without waiting for the prompting voice of a "monitor." As these forms, from including at first only the Legitima oratio and certain familiar ejaculations, became enlarged to embrace a more complex sacramental service, it would be found convenient to reduce them to writing. The construction of these liturgies would be a gradual process. Neither Chrysostom, nor Leo, nor any other of the Fathers, sat down to compose a form of public prayer. They compiled it from existing sources, adding something of their own, and arranging the whole according to their discretion. A complete service of prayer as certainly implies long and separate tentative essays towards it as a complete modern dictionary implies numberless imperfect attempts at lexicography. A Webster or a Worcester adopts the body of English words he finds already catalogued, and adds new ones. The dictionary, however, exists in the language before the vocabulary is arranged and defined; and a liturgy exists as soon as forms of prayer are employed, whether they are written down or not. The two great families of the early liturgies are the Eastern and the Western. In general it will be admitted that the Oriental Churches conducted their liturgy in every thing relating to worship, possessed forms of prayer sooner than the Latin, and that some of the Greek liturgies date back, in their elements, to a very early period. The most primitive of these, by the universal consent of critics, is that body of prayer found in the eighth book of the pseudo-Clementine Apostolical Constitutions. It does not, indeed, amount, in the strict sense, to a liturgy; since its forms are designed, not so much for the people as for the officiating minister. They were never used in any church. Probably they were never "published," but only privately circulated; but, viewed even in this light, they possess, for their character and the indications in them of a high antiquity, a marked value of their own.

The clumsy device by which the various parts of the diaitaes ("Constitutions") are ascribed to the several apostles is not to be understood as seriously meant to deceive. It was merely a rhetorical contrivance for giving authority and emphasis to the instructions, like the speeches in Thucydides and Sallust. But this apparent fraud, and the pseudo-epigraphic title, have thrown, upon the eighth book at least, an unmerited degree of discredit. It is the oldest body of prayer we have inherited from the primitive church, and exhibits the simplicity, the tenderness, the adoring reverence, with which believers in the earliest ages drew near the mercy-seat of God.

A few characteristic features of this liturgy may here be mentioned.

1. The prayers extend continuously to a great length. They are not broken up into parts, with an intermediate "amen"; and there is no appearance yet of the "collect."

2. The length of the prayers consists mostly in their taking the character of historical reviews of God's providence towards his church under the old dispensations. From this is drawn an argument for his continued watchful care over his people in all times.

3. Whoever may have been the author or authors of these prayers, they include passages of great sublimity and beauty as have ever entered into public devotion in any later times.

4. The fact of an elaborate hierarchy being implied, with ascertained rules for their ordination, the appointment of tithes for their support, the use of a certain apparatus in the sacramental service, the lighting of candles on the altar, prayers for the pious dead, etc., are no disproof of the ante-Nicene origin of these Constitutions. Contrariwise they only illustrate the early period at which such usages found their way into Christian worship. Two hundred years are a long period in human history, and afford room for great changes in human institutions, for the better or the worse; and there is evidence enough that changes of various kinds went on somewhat rapidly in the obscure twilight of the first centuries.

5. This early origin of the "Constitutions" is

[The oldest post-apostolic prayer is found in the portion of the first or genuine Epistle of Clement, discovered by Brénos, and published in Constantinople 1873. It is quite elaborate, and extends over three long columns (84.), 191.]
confirmed by various allusions to a condition of things prevailing in the church before the time of Constantine the Great; e.g., the still formidable power of heathenism, and the sufferings of Christians in mines and prisons.

6. The attribute of *σαρώμετος*, by which God is apostrophized as the "lover of human kind," and which is so characteristic of the Greek liturgies, appears that in the "Basilian Constitutions," re- nowned for the prayer of the invocation in the familiar hymn, "Jesus, lover of my soul."

7. The conclusion is, that these "Constitutions" exhibit the devotional spirit and method of the Oriental Church not later than the end of the third or beginning of the fourth century, with elements derived from the second and first.

In proceeding now to describe the early Christian liturgies, properly so called, we may notice

(1) That the number of them is very large, the far greater part Oriental; (2) That they are found alike in all parts of the church, from the Malabar coast to the Spanish peninsula; (3) That through all this broad extent of Christendom, Eastern and Western, in the various languages of Europe, Asia, and Northern Africa, the liturgies show a sufficiently close resemblance to indicate a common origin.

This resemblance appears in the following particulars: viz.,

1. They are all "sacramentaries." The Christian sacrifice is the central object about which all the parts of the service are gathered. In this respect the Protestant liturgies differ from them, since these may be said rather to be gathered about the sermon, and to relate to the whole worship of God, both regular and special; while the early liturgies neither include any forms for special occasions, nor make any reference to the preaching of the gospel.

2. They all include the element of prayer for the dead. This practice is so irreconcilable with the Protestant doctrine of probation as to be generally classed among the characteristic corruptions of the Church of Rome. It must therefore be with a certain sensation of surprise that the Protestant finds this usage, not merely in a few of the early liturgies, but in all of them without exception; from which it would follow that we have to take our choice between admitting that the practice is so in harmony with the yearnings of our nature as to spring up sporadically wherever there were Christian worshippers, or else that it was the common inheritance of the churches derived from the earliest times, before they were separated from each other. The Protestant finds a considerable relief, however, in discovering that these prayers imply no belief in the existence of a purgatory. Not the faintest allusion to any such place or state occurs in the early liturgies. The prayers "for the whole Catholic Church," included the departed saints as being in a state, not of purgatorial suffering, but of incomplete happiness; as being in paradise, and not yet in heaven.

3. There are many minor features, not requiring to be particularly dwelt upon, found alike in all these liturgies; such as the division of the service into the anaphora, or sacramental service, and the *anapaphora*, or sacramental service,—the use of the Lord's Prayer, the secret prayer of the minister (*oratio veli*), the mingling of water with the wine, the invocation of the Holy Spirit, and various rubrical directions, everywhere substantially the same.

4. It remains to be added that these were all true liturgies: they were adapted to the use of the congregation. The service is not all performed by the minister, but the people have their vocal share. The worship was going on throughout: the people reply at all the appropriate places.—*Habemus ad Dominum, Domine Misereere, Misereere Nostr, Deus Salvator Noster*, etc. They repeat aloud the *oratio dominica* (the Lord's Prayer), they respond the creed and the doxology, and, at the end of all the prayers, swell the chorus of the "Amen." This made a true service for the people (a *λεγειντος*), and justified the concluding prayer of thanksgiving, "O God, who hast given us grace with one accord to make these our common supplications unto thee," etc.
ties, powers, the many-eyed cherubim and seraphim, crying, one to another incessantly and with uninstructed praises, saying, "Here the people all join in the acclamation," "Holy, holy, holy Lord God of Sabaoth, heaven and earth are full of the glory."

The deacon then arranges the sacramental vessels; and the minister proceed with a prayer adoring the justice of God as illustrated in the creation and the fall of man, and his mercy as shown in the incarnation, life, ministry, atoning death, resurrection, ascension, mediatorial reign, and second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. This constitutes the pre-anaphoral service. The prayer ends with the words, "But he has left us a memorial of his saving passion; for when he was just going out to his voluntary, glorious, and life-giving death, in the same night wherein he gave himself up for the life of the world, taking bread into his holy and immaculate hands, and presenting it to thee, his God and Father, he gave thanks, blessed, sanctified, and brake it, and gave it to his holy apostles, saying" (and here begins the anaphora). "Take ye all, and eat: this is my body which is broken for you for the remission of sins." The consecration of the cup immediately follows in the same scriptural terms, concluding with "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show forth my death, and confess my resurrection." To the various parts of this service the people respond, "Amen. We praise thee, we bless thee, we give thanks to thee, O Lord, we make our supplications unto thee, O our God." An invocation to the Holy Spirit follows, and then a commemoration of the pious dead. A full prayer is then offered for all sorts and conditions of men,—for "our most religious emperors," for "enemies and persecutors;" for the "afflicted and persecuted in deserts, mountains, dens, and caves of the earth;" for "our brethren in court and camp;" for those absent on just occasions," and a great number of other classes of persons. This long prayer is followed by a brief litany in which the people continually respond to the various suffrages, "Lord, have mercy upon us," etc. At the close of all this, the sacramental emblems, the bread and the wine, are distributed at once to the people without further words. It is to be remembered that all this was the sacramental part of the service, at which none but the initiated or believers were permitted to attend, and that the missa catechumenorum, including the reading of the Scriptures and the bishop's sermon, at which all might be present, had preceded it.

The question now recurs as to the age to which this form of prayer belongs. Was it the composition of the great bishop of Cesarea? or was it merely compiled by him from earlier sources? Or, again, was it the production, as some of its contents might seem to indicate, of a considerably later time, sought to be passed off under so illustrious a name?

We begin with the testimony of Basil himself. He was the most illustrious light among the constellation of brilliant men that adorned the church of the fourth century, eminent alike as theologian, pulpit orator, church leader, and saint. No one could have known better than he the history and usages of the church. In the twenty-seventh chapter of his work De Spiritu Sancto, he is arguing, in defence of a certain form of trinitarian confession, against the objection that no such precise form was found in the Scriptures. Many things are lawfully practised in the church, he says. A written or no written authority can be found in the "saints;" such as making the sign of the cross, worshipping towards the east, standing in prayer on Sundays, trine immersion, etc. But these are all warranted by tradition. So, he adds, the method of consecrating the elements at the Eucharist is nowhere found set down in the writings of "the saints," but is regulated in accordance with the traditional doctrine of the church. This implies that there was a well-known and fixed form of sacramental liturgy sanctioned by long usage. It was not new, any more than the practice of making the sign of the cross, which we know was universal in the time of Tertullian, nearly two hundred years earlier, and therefore presumptively had been in use for a long period before him.

But it has been generally argued from the phrase employed in this passage, "the saints," that no forms for the sacramental service had ever been reduced to writing before Basil's time. But this view, involving "saints" as equivalent to "fathers." Bingham and others of the earlier writers, and even so careful a scholar as the author of the article Liturgie, in the new Herzog's Real Encyclopädie (von Zeeschwitz), have too hastily admitted this; whereas the whole extent of Basil's dictum is, that no such forms are found in the writings of the apostles. The context shows that he is referring only to the absence of scriptural authority for certain usages, which he maintains were notwithstanding lawful, anticipating in this the argument of Richard Hooker in his Ecclesiastical Polity. For aught that appears in this passage, therefore, there may have been already extant various less perfect sacramental liturgies, differing in different churches. What Basil effected was to reduce them all to one common form, to which his great name gave a currency that enabled it soon to swallow up the rest. This is the meaning of a passage in the funeral oration of Gregory Nazianzen for his illustrious friend (In laudem Basili, Orat. 43). Recounting the manifold activities of the Bishop of Cesarea, he says, that besides the erection and care of his almshouse and hospital, his unsleeping vigilance over his flock, his codes for the government of convents and monasteries, and his general regulation of the lives and duties of the clergy, he had also effected a compilation of the prayers of the church into a regular service (descriptio precum). This descriptio precum ("order of prayer") was merely a new and improved edition of the sacramental service already in use, just as the symboolum Romanum was not an original creed, but only an accurate and perfected summary of the various regulae fidei current among the churches. In both cases a competent authority sanctioned the new form, to which the others soon gave place. That this Basilian Liturgy was afterwards successively enlarged, modified, "interpolated," etc., is unquestionable; but these later "interpolations" are merely signs of its greater relative antiquity. They are not properly interpolations at all, since they merely record the successive changes in the doctrinal or the devotional system of the church.
following the footprints backward, we may find some ground for an opinion, to the period from which a liturgy was actually in use in the church.

About the year 347, Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, preached at the Easter festival those discourses which are known under the name of Catecheses mystagogiae, or instructions to candidates preparatory to communion. The fifth of these lectures contains a commentary on the Lord's Prayer. It is directed to explaining to the catechumens the reasons for the various parts of the service,—the washing of hands, the kiss of peace, the prayers, the responses of the people, and the administration of the Eucharist.

Now, it is to be observed here that Cyril is not proposing any new forms or rites, but takes the whole routine of the service for granted, and is merely giving to the catechumens, in a plain and simple way suited to the stage of their religious education, the reasons for the various parts. It is not different from a short sermon to Sunday-school children at the close of the day, explaining the nature of the church service. It may be safely assumed, then, that the forms thus expounded had been in use for a length of time; that they were the same in which Cyril himself had been trained in his childhood before the Council of Nice, and the same in which his parents and teachers had been educated during the long peace preceding the last persecution.

When we have reached this point, we come upon the trail of the pseudo-Clementine Liturgy; and this, in the same way, may be believed to exhibit the worship of the church as it was in the first half of the third century, reaching back, quite probably, to the time of Tertullian. That the worship of the church in his day was, to a considerable degree, simple and spontaneous, may be easily admitted; but that it may not have been, to some extent, conducted according to an ascertained ritual, is far from being decided, as is often assumed, by his well-known phrase sine monitor quo de pectore (Apologeticus, 29). If the prayer was extemporaneous, the people certainly did not pray sine monitore, since the minister went before them, and dictated the words they were to adopt; and if an accustomed form was used, as would seem far the most likely in regular prayer for magistrates, it might still be equally de pectore. The natural meaning of this much-buffed phrase would seem to be that Christians prayed for their rulers, as for others, without needing any command or summons, because they prayed cheerfully, and from the impulses of their own hearts.

We are not concerned to attempt tracing the growth of liturgical forms amid the dim twilight of the second century. The conclusion will be, that in the simple worship described by Justin Martyr, in which nothing more appears of a liturgical course than a certain order of service, with common prayers, the regular administration of the Lord's Supper on the day called Sunday,—the kiss of charity, the vocal amen, etc., we have the germs that were gradually developed into the full liturgies of the fourth and fifth centuries.

To this must be added the positive conclusion, drawn from all experience, that no great change in the religious usages of a people is made in a day, or by the authority of any individual. Religious usages are above all others persistent, and while admitting, without serious difficulty, of immaterial modification from the period to period, from the same generation to the next. We infer, therefore, that, when Basil compiled his descriptions precum, he presented nothing to startle the church of his time as new, but only an arrangement of their old familiar liturgy, with such new prayers as any bishop was at liberty to add. We may infer the same in the Eucharistic services of Constantine, lectured by Cyril, and of the Clementine Liturgy. When we have reached that far, we have no doubt got back among the origines liturgiae of the Christian Church, and may well be excused from groping any farther in the dark.

The other great family of liturgies, though much smaller in numbers, is the Western. In tracing the process of their development, the baseline from which to work backward would be the Gregorian rite of the year 600 A.D. In the same way as before, it might be shown that this was only a new and improved edition of the sacramentary of Gelasianus of A.D. 496, as that was of the Leonian Liturgy of A.D. 451; and that the descriptions left us by Innocent I. (A.D. 404) and other of the Fathers, imply regular forms of prayer in the Church of Rome at still earlier periods. This deduction, as well as a particular account of the Roman service, our limits oblige us to dispense with.

We only add, that, omitting certain superstitious usages which had grown up in the church, these liturgies, containing as they do all the elements of the evangelical doctrine, and embodying a large part of the divine word, were admirably adapted to nourish the sentiment of religion among the people, and prove the vehicle for Christ's promise that the gates of hell should never prevail against his church. It must be regarded as unfortunate that their prejudice against popery and prelacy should have led Presbyterians so generally to cut themselves off from these rich sources of devotional culture, which have no necessary connection with either the one system or the other.

Protestant Liturgies.—Luther, Calvin, and the other Protestant leaders, who eliminated out of the worship of God the corrupt usages of the Church of Rome, found nothing objectionable in the mere fact of a regular form of prayer. They lost no time in providing suitable liturgies for the various countries that embraced the Reformation, each having its own national service. In 1523 Luther published his Lateinische Messe, and in 1526 the same, with improvements, in German. In 1538 Calvin issued his liturgy for the church of Strassburg, and in 1541 that for the church in Geneva, containing both ordinary and special services. In 1554 John Knox published a form of worship for the Scottish Kirk, modelled on that of Geneva. These liturgies all left room, in some part of the service, for the exercise of free prayer. The English Book of Common Prayer was compiled in 1549, by Cranmer and Ridley, from several Roman missals in use in various parts of England, portions of it being adopted from Butler's liturgy, particularly the forms of confession and absolution; no great change in the service is due to its having been compiled, to a great extent, from the Latin sacramentaries of Leo and Gelasius, with additions made in the devout
spirit and refined taste of Cranmer. A hundred years later, the growing alienation between the adherents of episcopacy and of presbyterian services altogether, and to depend on the gift of extemporaneous prayer in their ministers. Eventually the two usages came to be characteristic of the two forms of church government; the Episcopalians all worshipping by means of liturgical prayer, though there is no reason in the nature of things why they might not both worship in the one way or the other; or, better still, why both methods should not be united in all public worship.

In the progress of the nineteenth century a general liturgical revival took place in various non-Episcopal churches in Germany, where a new form of service — the Agende — was drawn for the Evangelical Union, under the patronage of the king of Prussia. In 1858 a committee of the General Assembly of the Scottish kirk reported a collection of forms of worship for the use of soldiers, sailors, etc., which received the unanimous sanction of the Assembly. A few years since, the Church Service Society issued their Euchologios, or Book of Common Order, which has reached a fourth edition, and is working a marked but silent change in the public Presbyterian worship of Scotland. The Liturgy of the Catholic Apostolic Church (Irvingite), based on the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, is of a highly rich and elaborate character, corresponding with the hierarchical development in that enthusiastic communion. The daily prayer offered in every Irvingite Church gives thanks for the restoration of the order of the apostles, and for the warning, announced through them, of the nearness of the day of Christ's appearing. It contains, also, in the sense of the early liturgies, an intercession for the pious dead.

In the United States, except in the Episcopalian, Lutheran, German and Dutch Reformed, and Moravian churches, liturgical prayer has been almost wholly disused; but from the middle of the present century a marked tendency has developed itself in favor of increased dignity and variety in Presbyterian public worship. In 1855 Dr. Baird produced the Presbyterian Book of Common Prayer, by Professor Shields of Princeton, is merely a republication of the Anglican Prayer-Book, with the exceptions offered by the Presbyterians at the Savoy Conference. The liturgy and the ancient prayers are freely but judiciously altered, and many excellent new prayers are added. In 1857 the German Reformed Church issued a new Order of Worship, which is based upon a careful study of the liturgies of the ancient Church and the Reformation period, and resembles in many respects the Anglican liturgy. It was agreed by the ministers and congregations. The Dutch Reformed Church follows the old Palatinate Liturgy. The Lutherans in America use part of the German Lutheran Agenda, or new church books based upon them. The Moravians have a very rich evangelical liturgy in German and English, with responses and confessions of faith.

We are led naturally, in conclusion, to a brief view of the respective advantages of liturgical and of free prayer. In favor of the latter it is claimed that this is the natural method, and alone corresponds to the impulses of the devout mind; that prayer by means of prescribed forms cramps the free expression of the desires to God, and tends to spiritual torpor and poverty. To this it is replied, that the objection is urged only by such as are unaccustomed to liturgical worship; that those familiar with it find it promotes attention and devotion in prayer; that it rates the sentiment of the communion of saints in all times and all ages, since the church, from a very early period till now, and throughout the larger part of Christendom, has worshipped, and continues to worship, by means of the same forms; that it would be as reasonable to insist that the minister should make his own hymns as his own prayers; and that, if a prayer-book in the hands of a worshipper is unfavorable to spirituality of worship, a hymn-book should be equally so; that David's written prayers are used with eminent profit by Christians as the expression of their religious sentiments; that worship, being the common act of the whole congregation, may properly be conducted by forms common to all; while preaching, being the work of the minister for the instruction of the people, is necessarily the act of one; and other similar arguments. On the other hand, it is admitted that occasions may frequently arise in the history of every congregation, calling for mention in public prayer, — as dangers, afflictions, spiritual prosperity, or decay, — for which a liturgy cannot provide. The conclusion reached by eminent members of both liturgical and non-liturgical churches is, that a system which should unite the propriety and dignity of venerable forms with the flexibility and adaptation to occasions of free prayer, would be superior to any existing method.

Lit. — The authorities chiefly consulted during the preparation of this article have been the original liturgies in the Abbé Moreau's Patrologia, with the learned historical essays of MAHILLON, MURATORI, MONE, and others; the Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio, by RENAULT; BRETT: Eastern Liturgies; PAMELIUS: Liturgicon; NEALE: Liturgies of the Holy Eastern Church; PALMER: Origins Liturgiae; HAMMOND: Antient Liturgies, and many other modern sources. For the English Prayer-Book see especially PROCTOR, BLUNT, BUTLER, and LUCKOCK. See LEE: Glossary of Liturgical Terms, London, 1876; also art. Liturgy, in Encyclopaedia Britannica, 9th ed., vol. xiv. See PRAYER-BOOK. S. M. HOPKINS.

LIUDGERUS, or LUDGERUS, St., b. about 744; d. March 26, 809. He descended from a Frisian but Christian family; was educated in the school of Utrecht; studied at York, under Alcuin; labored for seven years as a missionary among the Frisians; visited Rome, and was by Charlemagne, to whom he was recommended by Alcuin, first sent as missionary among the Frisians; and then, after the subjugation of the Saxons, bishop of the newly founded see of Münster. Of his activity as bishop very little is known. He founded the monastery of Werden, and wrote a life of Gregory, his teacher at Utrecht. The sources for his life have been collected by Dr. Diekamp, in the fourth volume of his Geschichtsquellen d. Bistums Münster (Münster, 1881), who
LIUDPRAND.

has separately published, in the same place and year, *De Vita sancti Liudgeri*. His biography has been written by Bruenning, in Paderborn, 1843; [Hüsing, Münster, 1878]; and Pingsmann, Freiburg, 1879.

LIUDPRAND, or LIUTPRAND, whose works form one of the principal sources for the history of the tenth century, was born in Italy, of a distinguished Lombard family, and was educated at the court of Pavia. He served first King Be- regar, and then Otho I., who made him bishop of Cremona. His works are, *Antapodosis* (887-949), *Liber de rebus gestis Ottonis* (960-964), and *Relatio de legatione Constantinopolitana* (968-969). They were edited by Pertz, in Mon. Germ. iii. 264-303; new ed. by Dümmler, 1877.

LIVERPOOL, the famous commercial city on the Mersey, with a population of 552,425, was made the seat of a bishopric in 1880; and John Charles Ryle, D.D., was made first incumbent. The income of the see is thirty-five hundred pounds; and St. Peter's was constituted the pro-cathedral, pending the construction of a more suitable building.

LIVINGSTON, John Henry, D.D., "the father of the Reformed Dutch Church in America;" b. at Poughkeepsie, N.Y., May 30, 1748; d. in New Brunswick, N.J., Jan. 20, 1825. He was graduated at Yale College, 1762; studied law for two years; was converted, and, on advice of Archibald Laidie (see art.), sailed for Utrecht, Holland, May 12, 1766, there to study theology. He was "the last of the American youth who went thither for education and ordination." He was licensed by the Classis of Amsterdam, 1769; was called by the New-York Consistory, May 30, 1769; took the degree of doctor of divinity the next year; and on Sept. 3, 1770, arrived, and took his place as second English preacher in the Reformed Dutch Church in New York. The Revolution drove him from the city. He settled first at Kingston (1776), then at Albany (November, 1776-79), and at Livingston Manor (1779-81), Poughkeepsie (1781-83). But on the close of hostilities (1783) he returned to the city. In 1784 he was appointed by the general synod professor of didactic and polemic theology; and in 1810 the synod called him to New Brunswick to open a theological seminary there, and at the same time he was elected president of Queen's (now Rutgers') College. These two offices he held until his death. It is said that his reason in entering the Dutch Church ministry was his desire to heal its dissensions.

LIVINGSTONE, David, LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S., F.R.G.S., was born in Southern and Central Africa; b. at Blantyre, seven miles from Glasgow, in Scotland, March 19, 1813; d. April 30, 1873, in Iala, Africa. His father and mother were of the working-class, but of the highest moral and Christian worth. The father was a great reader, and deeply interested in the cause of Christian missions, then just beginning to attract attention. After a very short time at school, David was sent, at the age of ten, to a cotton-mill, where he spent the next twelve years of his life. The reading of Dick's *Philosophy of a Future State* led to his conversion; and an appeal from Gutzlaff, for missionaries to China, determined him to be a medical missionary. After attending theological and medical classes for two sessions at Glasgow, he offered his services to the London Missionary Society; and, being provisionally approved, he spent a further period in study at Ongar in Essex, and at London. In 1840 he passed at Glasgow as Licentiate of the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons, and in November of the same year was ordained a missionary, under the London Missionary Society. His desire had been to go to China; but the opium war, in which, unhappily, England was then engaged, put a stop to that project. In London he had met with the Rev. Robert Moffat, who was then on furlough in England; and, having become greatly interested in what he told him of Africa, he received an appointment as a missionary there.

For a time he was occupied in work at Kuru- man (Dr. Moffat's station) and in missionary tours to the north, undertaken to gain knowledge of the state of the people, and to find out a suitable locality for a new station. Already Livingstone had shown a fixed determination not to labor in the more accessible regions, but to strike out beyond. He early acquired a great liking for the plan of native agency; and his ambition was to scatter native agents far and near. He was remarkable for the influence he obtained from the very first,—partly through medical practice, and partly by his tact, and the charm of his manner over both chiefs and people. He also, from the first, took a lively interest in the natural productions of the country and in its structure and scientific history. After a time he settled at Mabotea (in 1843) among the Bakhatia. While there, he had a wonderful escape from being killed by a lion; and while there, likewise, he married Mary Moffat, a daughter of Dr. Moffat. From Mabotea, circumstances led him to remove to Chounane, and from that again to Kolobeng, where he lived till 1852. His people were a tribe of Bakwains, whose chief, Sechde, became a convert to Christianity. In his desire to attract native missionaries to that part of Africa, he made an excursion into the Transvaal Republic,—a large territory that had been taken possession of by Boer emigrants from the Cape of Good
Hope: but the Boers were no friends of missions, and, instead of encouraging him, did their utmost to thwart his plans.

Baffled in this direction, Livingstone determined to make explorations on the north; but a serious obstacle was the great Kalahari Desert, which at times could not be traversed for want of water. Three times Livingstone got to the north of it. Thrice he set out from Linyanti toward the western coast, with twenty-seven attendants, and after incredible hardships, including twenty-seven attacks of fever, at length reached the abodes of civilization at Loanda. Instead of making for Britain, Livingstone resolved to go back with his attendants to Linyanti, and then cross to the opposite shore of the continent. After a long time of labor and difficulty, in which his tact, his patience, and his faith were exposed to the severest strain, he reached Quelimane on May 26, 1856; the whole time of his journey since he left the Cape, in 1852, being almost four years.

Livingstone made many important discoveries during these years; the most important being the existence of a tableland in Central Africa, depressed in the centre, with two ridges flanking it, which were free from the unhealthy influences prevalent in the lower-lying localities.

Consequently the utmost anxiety was felt throughout native land, and showers of honors were poured upon him. Everywhere he was received with enthusiasm; and an extraordinary interest began to prevail on Africa, hitherto an unpopular continent. He wrote and published his first book, Missionary Travels. He saw it his duty to sever his connection with the London Missionary Society; believing that he could be more useful, alike for exploring, civilizing, and missionary purposes, in another capacity. He accepted an appointment as commander of an expedition sent by government to explore the River Zambesi, and to report on the probability of the existence of a communication between the interior and the coast for sale. This expedition was signalized by the discovery of the Lake Nyassa, and much important territory in its neighborhood. Livingstone was very desirous to see missions and colonists planted in this neighborhood, which rightly deemed to be the key of Central Africa. A Universities' Mission, manned by missionaries from Oxford and Cambridge, was planted near Nyassa. But it was very unfortunate; the bishop who was its head, and several of the missionaries, being cut off very early. The death of Mrs. Livingstone was another great trial and discouragement. At last the expedition was recalled; but Livingstone, who had spent most of the profits of his book on a steamer of his own, remained for a time, trying to explore the country more fully. At last he, too, saw it desirable to return. He wished to expose the atrocious proceedings of the Portuguese in the matter of the slave-trade, and to find means of establishing a settlement at the head of the River Rovuma, beyond the Portuguese lines. Writing a short book might help both projects.

Home he accordingly went, via Bombay, in 1864; spending a great part of his time at Newstead Abbey, where he wrote The Zambesi and its Tributaries. While in England, it was suggested to him by an old friend, Sir Roderick Murchison, that it would be a great geographical feat to ascertain the watershed of Central Africa, beyond the Portuguese lines. Writing a short book might help both projects.

Home he accordingly went, via Bombay, in 1864; spending a great part of his time at Newstead Abbey, where he wrote The Zambesi and its Tributaries. While in England, it was suggested to him by an old friend, Sir Roderick Murchison, that it would be a great geographical feat to ascertain the watershed of Central Africa, beyond the Portuguese lines. Writing a short book might help both projects.
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Amid all the vicissitudes of his career, Livingstone remained faithful to his missionary character. His warmth and purity of heart, his intense devotion to his Master and to the African people for his Master's sake, his patience, endurance, trustfulness, and prayerfulness, his love of science. His wide humanity, his intense charity, have given to his name and memory an undying fragrance. After his death, that seemed the death-blow to his plans, and tried for sedition, but acquitted. Bishop Lloyd was the author of many pamphlets, and of one valuable production, An Historical Account of Church Government as it was in Great Britain and Ireland when they first received the Christian Religion, London, 1684, reprinted, Oxford, 1842.

LLOB, Jeronimo, b. in Lisbon, 1593; d. there 1678. After entering the order of the Jesuits, he taught for some time in their college at Coimbra, but in 1624 to Abyssinia as a missionary. After staying there for several years, he returned to Portugal in 1634. In 1640 he went to Goa as a missionary, and died there 1656. After his second return to Portugal, he published, in 1659, a History of Abyssinia, which, together with the continuation by Legrand, and other additions, was translated into English by Samuel Johnson, in 1795.

LOBWASSER, Ambrosius, b. at Schneeberg, Misnias, April 4, 1515; d. at Königsberg, Nov. 27, 1585. He studied law at Leipzig; visited the universities of Louvain, Paris, and Bologna; and was in 1558 appointed chancellor of Misnia, and in 1563 professor of jurisprudence in Königsberg. In 1573 he published at Leipzig a German translation of Beza and Marot's French translation of the Psalms. The work was, in literary respects, quite mediocre: but the translation was made to fit the tunes of Goudimel; and thereby the book became the generally accepted hymn-book of the Reformed Congregations in Germany, and continued so for nearly two centuries. The library of Stuttgart contains no less than sixty editions of the book. It was translated into Latin, Danish, and Italian. See Félix BOYET: Histoire du Peauteur des églises réformées, Paris, 1872; WELZ: Geschichte der Kirchenlieder in der deutsch-reformierten Kirche, Ziirich, 1876; O. DONEN: Clément Marot et le Peauteur huguenot, Paris, 1878-79, 2 vols. RICHARD LAUXMANN.

LOCAL PREACHERS—are laymen, members of the Methodist Church and of the district and quarterly conferences, by which bodies they are licensed to preach, and to which they are amenable. As a class they stand opposite to the ‘travelling’ preachers, who are members, also, of the annual conferences. They are independent of episcopal appointment, or of appointment by stationing committees. They are required annually to make a report, and have their licenses renewed. After four consecutive years’ service, they are eligible to the office of local deacon, and then, after four years more of service, to the office of local elder. They may have a regular pastoral charge. The Methodist Church owes much to the fidelity and zeal of her local preachers.

LOCI THEOLOGICI is the name which Melanchthon gave to his representation of evangelical dogmatics, in opposition to the sententiae of the schoolmen. In classical language, loci means the fundamental conceptions of any department.
of knowledge. The name was thus very appropriate, and was retained by the theologians of the Lutheran Church down to the middle of the seventeenth century. He was also adopted by some theologians of the Reformed faith, such as Musculus, Peter Martyr, J. Macov, and Daniel Chamier.

LOCKE, John, was born at Wrington, Somersetshire, Aug. 29, 1632. His father was a lawyer, possessed of moderate landed property, and a firm adherent of the parliamentary and nonconformist party. His father exacted great respect from him when a child, but, as he grew up, allowed him greater familiarity,—a practice which the son recommends. He was educated at the famous Westminster school; and in 1651 he entered Christ Church, Oxford (in the grounds of which is still shown the Mulberry-tree which he planted), where he was a diligent student, and devoted himself specially to the branches requiring thought. He did not follow any profession; but he was particularly addicted to the study of medicine, in which Sydenham declares that he acquired great reputation from himself. He returned, to politics and philosophy. In 1684, during the Dutch war, he accompanied, as secretary, Sir W. Vane, the king's envoy, to the elector of Brandenburg; and there is much humor in the account he gives of his journey. In 1689 he came acquainted with the statesman Lord Ashley, afterwards Lord Shaftesbury, and became his medical adviser, counsellor, and friend. Henceforth his life is partly in Oxford, and partly with Shaftesbury, who appointed him to various public offices. Though very prudent, he became an object of suspicion to the royal party. Sunderland, by the king's command, ordered his expulsion. He was not expelled from Oxford, but deprived of his studentship by the dean and chapter of the college. He retreated to Holland, and lived in Amsterdam and Utrecht, where he had close intercourse with a number of eminent men, who met in each other's houses for discussion,—with Le Clerc, Guesnon the physician, with Limborch, and with the Remonstrant or Arminian party. The revolution of 1688 enabled him to return to his own country, bringing with him his Essay on Human Understanding, which he had been engaged in writing since 1671, and which he published in 1690. Henceforth his literary activity was very great. He carried on an extensive correspondence (afterwards published) on philosophic subjects with his admirer, William Molyneux of Dublin, who introduced his essay into Dublin university, where it held sway down to the second quarter of this century. He carried on a keen controversy with Stillingfleet, bishop of Worcester, who objected to his doctrine of substance as undermining the doctrine of the Trinity. He wrote three letters on Toleration, on which his views, perhaps derived in part from John Owen at first, became known as liberal for his day, though much behind the opinions then entertained. He would give no toleration to atheists or papists. In a constitution he drew out for the Carolinas, viz., perception, retention, discernment, comparison, composition, abstraction, to which he adds volition. He divides the qualities of matter into primary and secondary; the former being those in all matter, in whatever state it be, and the latter resulting from the operation of the others.

He published in 1695 the Essay on the Reasonableness of Christianity as delivered in the Scriptures. He wrote a Commentary consisting of paraphrases and notes on the Epistles to the Galatians, Corinithians, Romans, and Ephesians, together with An Essay for the Understanding of St. Paul's Epistles by consulting St. Paul himself. His expositions are clear, but are throughout strongly rationalist, and opposed to the atonement and to what is usually characterized as evangelistic.

His health had never been good, and latterly became worse. From 1691 he resided with Sir Francis and Lady Masham (daughter of Ralph Cudworth) at Oates. On Oct. 27, 1704, he told Lady Masham that he never expected to rise again from his bed. "He thanked God he had passed a happy life; but that now he found that all was vanity, and exhorted her to consider this world as a preparation for a better state hereafter." Next day he heard Lady Masham read the Psalms, apparently with great attention, until, perceiving his end to draw near, he stopped her, and expired a few minutes after, about three o'clock in the afternoon of Oct. 28, 1704, in his seventy-third year.

He tells us what was the occasion of the production of the Essay on Human Understanding. "Five or six friends meeting at my chamber, and discoursing on a subject very remote from this, found themselves quickly at a stand by the difficulties that rose on every side. After we had a while puzzled ourselves, without coming any nearer a resolution of those doubts which perplexed us, it came into my thoughts that we took our understandings were or were not fitted to deal with." He defines idea, "whatsoever is the object of the understanding when a man thinks," "whatever is meant by phantasm, notion, species." But surely external things may be the object of the understanding when it thinks; and yet they seem to be excluded by the definition, which leads him logically in idealism. He maintains that we get all our ideas from experience, through the two inlets, or windows, sensation and reflection.

The Essay is divided into four books. In the first he shows that we have no innate ideas, speculative (such as it is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be at the same time) or practical (moral) maxims; and that the ideas (such as that of God) often supposed to be innate are not so. I believe he is right in saying that there are not in the mind any innate mental images, or abstract general notions, or a priori forms as is maintained by Kant; but he has not thereby shown that there are not in the mind innate fundamental laws, such as that of cause and effect, which regulate our thinking.

In the second book he makes an elaborate attempt to show that all our ideas are derived from the materials supplied by sensation and reflection, always by the faculties which the mind possesses; viz., perception, retention, discernment, comparison, composition, abstraction, to which he adds volition. He divides the qualities of matter into primary and secondary; the former being those in all matter, in whatever state it be, and the latter resulting from the operation of the others.
He divides ideas into simple and complex. The former are perceived at once. Among these, the idea of space is given by sight and touch; of time, from the reflection on the succession of our ideas,—as if succession did not imply the idea of time. Complex ideas are divided into modes (such as as gratitude), substantias, and relations. He felt to substance exists as an unknown thing, standing under qualities. From his two sources he derives our idea of infinity, making it simply negative, and our very idea of moral good, deriving it from the sensation of pleasure and pain, with the law of God rewarding certain actions, and punishing others. It was in regard to this latter idea that the defects of his system were first seen by British thinkers.

In the third book he treats of the relation of words to ideas, and has very shrewd but often extreme remarks on the evil influence exercised by language on thought. In the fourth book he treats of knowledge, which he defines as "the perception of the connection, and agreement or disagreement, and repugnancy, of any of our ideas; holding that the mind hath no other immediate objects in all its thoughts and reasonings but its own ideas." Knowledge is usually represented as consisting in the agreement of our ideas with things. Locke's definition keeps us away from things, and issues logically in idealism. In the same book he treats of such subjects as intuitions, faith, and reason. He believes in intuition, but confines it to judgment, or the comparison of ideas, thus still keeping us away from things. Under reason he examines and condemns the syllogism, which he regards as a new mode of reasoning, whereas it is merely an analysis of the process which passes through the mind in all valid reasoning.

The publication of the Essay was hailed with acclamation by the rising generation. Written in a clear, somewhat loose, and conversational style, characterized throughout by profound sense, free from all technicalities, and appealing, as the rising physical science of the day did, to observation and experiment, Locke continued to be the most influential philosopher in England, Ireland, France, and America, the whole of the last century and the first quarter of this, being modified, however, so far by the Scottish school.

His principles, however, were soon followed out to consequences which he would have repudiated. His essay was introduced into France by Voltaire, and was professedly carried out to its extreme by Condillac, who reduced the original inlets of ideas to one, sensation; urging that Locke's reflection looked merely to the sensations, and could produce nothing new. For ages Locke was spoken of in France and Germany as a sensationalist. He is certainly not liable to this charge, since everywhere insists on reflection as a source of ideas.

Bishop Berkeley drove his philosophy to a different issue. As Locke represented the mind as percipient only of ideas, we have no proof that any thing else exists. I believe this to be a consequence which might be drawn from his principles. But Locke was a determined realist. Reid and the Scottish school acted wisely in correcting his idealism, and in maintaining that we primarily know things, and not mere ideas.

The grand objection taken to Locke by our higher philosophers, is, that, by deriving all our ideas from sensation and reflection, he was found to be a great sceptic as to the defences of truth. He is charged by Kant and his school with starting with principles which has historically and logically in the scepticism of Hume. First, Berkeley proved, that, according to his philosophy, we have only ideas; and then Hume showed that these can be reduced to impressions and the faint copies of these in ideas. Locke's fundamental and most injurious error is the account which he gives of moral good and evil, which he represents as nothing but pleasure and pain drawn on us as a reward and punishment by the Lawgiver. He was met on this point by the third Lord Shaftesbury, the grandson of his friend and patron. His omissions on these points have been supplied in one way by the Scottish school, who bring in primary reason, common sense, and intuition, and in another by Kant, who calls in a priori principles in the shape of forms of sense, understanding, and reason.

Leibnitz wrote a review of Locke's essay, book by book, and chapter by chapter, in his Sur l'Entendemenl Humain, which, in consequence of Locke dying when he was writing it, was not published till 1781. Cousin also wrote a criticism in his Systeme de Locke. Professor Green has a sharply critical examination on Hegelian principles, in his Introduction to Hume's Treatise. See Lord King: Life of Locke; H. R. Fox Bourne: Life of Locke, Lond., 1876, 2 vols. James McCosh.

Locust, an insect belonging to the order Orthoptera, the group Saltatoria, the family Acrididae, and living, in several species, in Egypt, Arabia, Syria, Persia, and other Eastern countries. The common Syrian locust looks very much like the grasshopper. It is two inches and a half long, and grayish-green with black spots. These insects live in immense swarms, and are extremely voracious. Dung fresh by all winds, they suddenly sweep down on the country with a noise as of rain or hail; and in an extremely short time they completely denude it, eating up every flower and fruit, every grass and leaf. As always, they move with the wind, they are often carried to the ocean, and drowned by the ton. In some regions they are gathered, and used for food, being prepared in various ways,—boiled with butter, preserved with salt, dried, and ground to a powder, etc.

The Bible has no less than ten different Hebrew names for locust, which are rendered by "locust," "grasshopper," "palmer-worm," "beetle," etc. It may be that some of these ten names designate various stages in the development of the locust; but it seems more probable that they simply designate various species. As the locusts actually form one of the greatest scourges of the East, they are very graphically described in the Bible. Their multitude,—Exod. vi. 5; Jer. xlvii. 28; Joel ii. 10; their voracity,—Joel i. 4, 7, 12; Ps. lxxvi. 40; Isa. xxxiii. 4; the noise of their flight,—Joel ii. 5; Rev. ix. 9. Their being used as food is also mentioned: Lev. xi. 22; Matt. iii. 4; Mark i. 6.
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LODENSTEIN, Jodokus von, b. at Delft, in Holland, 1620; d. at Utrecht, 1877. He was appointed minister of the church in Utrecht, 1644, of Sluis, in Flanders, 1650, of Sluys, in 1652, and of Utrecht, 1655; and he occupies the church history of the Netherlands a position somewhat similar to that which Spener occupies in the church history of Germany: he was a reformer of practical life, not of doctrine. The Netherlands had at that time reached the culminating point of its prosperity, and the popular mind seemed to be entirely absorbed by secular pursuits. Lodestin, however, made a deep and widespread impression, both by his preaching, by his writings (Verfallenes Christenthum, Reformationsspiegel, etc.), and by his beautiful spiritual songs. 

LOEN, Johann Michael von, b. at Frankfurt, Dec. 21, 1864; d. July 26, 1770. He studied law at Marburg and Halle; travelled in Holland, France, Switzerland, and Italy; and lived for many years as a private gentleman in his native city, until, in 1758, he accepted a position in the Prussian civil service as president of the countship of Lingen and Teklenburg. The reconciliation of all the various denominations into which Christendom is split up, and the establishment of a united Christian Church, one and undivided, was the great idea of his life, in behalf of which he wrote, Evangelischer Friedensempflog, 1724; Höchst bedenkliche Ursachen, etc., 1727; Wiedenklen von Separatisten, 1737; Vereinigung der Protestant ten, 1748. His principal work, Die einzige wahre Religion (1750), has the same tendency. It is a singular blending of rationalism and pietism, reducing Christianity to a religion among other religions, and its essential truth to that which it has in common with all religions. It made a great sensation, however, and was translated into foreign languages.

WAGERMANN.

LOGAN, John, b. at Soutra, East Lothian, Scot land, 1748; d. in London, Dec. 28, 1788. He was educated at Edinburgh University, licensed in 1770, and ordained in South Leith, 1773. He had already evinced considerable poetical talent by the publication of original poems in connection with those of Michael Bruce, whose poems he edited 1770. In 1775 he served on the committee of the general assembly to revise the Translations and Paraphrases, and adapt them for public worship. The collection is still in use. Eleven of the paraphrases are his. In 1781 he published a collected edition of his poems, and a tragedy (Runnamede) in 1783. In 1786 he resigned in consequence of his theatrical labors, and went to London, where he led a literary life. His View of Ancient History (1788), attributed to a Dr. Rutherford, and two volumes of his Serasons (1790–91), which are much admired, were posth umously published. A complete edition of his poems, and a memoir, appeared in 1812. His most famous poem was Ode to the Cuckoo.

LOGOS (лат. Logos, Rich means "reason" and "word," ratio and oratio; both being intimately connected) has a peculiar signification in Philo, St. John, and the early Greek Fathers, and is an important term in the history of Chris tology.

I. THE DOCTRINE OF PHIL. — Philo, a Jewish philosopher of Alexandria (d. about A.D. 40), who endeavored to harmonize the Mosaic religion with Platonism, derived his Logos view from the Solomonic and later Jewish doctrine of the per sulated Wisdom and Word of God, and combined it with the Platonie idea of Nous. The Logos is to him the embodiment of all divine powers and ideas, — the aggelos of the Old Testament, the dômos and idea of Plato. He distinguished between the Logos inherent in God (logos evdótheta), corresponding to reason in man, and the Logos emanating from God (epexegetēs), corresponding to the spoken word which reveals the thought. The former contains the ideal world (the konios nosos): the latter is the first-begotten Son of God, the image of God, the Creator and Preserver, the Giver of light and life, the Mediador between God and the world, also the Messiah (though only in an ideal sense, as a theophrany, not as a concrete historical person). Philo wavers between a personal and an impersonal conception of the Logos, but leans more to the impersonal conception. He has no room for an incarnation of the Logos and his real union with humanity. Nevertheless, his view has a striking resemblance to the Logos doc trine of John, and preceded it, as a shadow precedes the substance. It was a prophetic dream of the coming reality. It prepared the minds of many for the reception of the truth, but misled others into Gnostic errors.


II. THE DOCTRINE OF ST. JOHN. — John uses Logos (translated "word") six times as a design ation of the divine pre-existent person of Christ, through whom the world was made, and who became incarnate for our salvation, John i. 1, 14; 1 John i. 1 (v. 7 is spurious); Rev. xix. 13; but he never puts it into the mouth of Christ. Philo may possibly have suggested the use of the term (although there is no evidence of John's having read a single line of Philo); but the idea was derived from the teaching of Christ and from the Old Testament, which makes a distinction between the hidden and the revealed being of God, which personifies the wisdom of God and the word of God, and ascribes the creation of the world to the same (Ps. xxxiii. 6, Sept.). There is an inherent propriety of this usage in the Greek language, where Logos is masculine, and has the double meaning of thought and speech. Christ as to his divine nature bears the same relation to God as the word does to the idea. The word gives form and shape to the idea, and is similar to others. The word is thought expressed (logos
LGHE.


The Logos was one in essence or nature with God (θεὸς ὢς, John i. 1), yet personally distinct from him, and in closest communion with him (πρὸς τὸν θεόν, John i. 1, 18). In the fulness of time he assumed human nature, and wrought out in it the salvation of the race which was created through him (John i. 14). The incarnation of the eternal, divine Logos is the central idea of the theology of John, who was for this reason emphatically called "the theologian;" and the confession or denial of this truth is to him the criterion of genuine Christianity or Antichrist (comp. 1 John iv. 2, 3).


III. THE PATRIARCHIC DOCTRINE. — The Johannine Logos doctrine was the fruitful germ of most of the patristic and Gnostic speculations on the divine nature of Christ. Justin Martyr (d. 165) started the patristic development which culminated in the harnesis of the Nicene Creed. He, first among the Fathers, used the term "Logos" as applied to the prehistoric Christ in the double sense of divine reason and creative word. Christ is to him the primitive reason or wisdom of divine essence, yet distinct from the Father, begotten of the will of the Father before all creatures, the first-begotten and only-begotten of God (πρῶτος ὢς, ὠς μονογενὴς, ὠς μόνος νῦς, ὡς λόγος πρὸ τῶν παντῶν καὶ σων ἐν γνωσιν). Through him the world was made. He is the organ of all revelations in history which are not confined to the Jewish people. He scattered seeds of truth and virtue among the nobler heathen (λόγος σπηνικτικός). All that is true and beautiful in Socrates, Plato, Homer, must be traced to the activity of the Logos before his incarnation (ὁ λόγος ὁ δώρος). This Logos was incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth, was born, baptized, suffered, died, and rose for us men and our salvation. There is no doubt that Justin Martyr considered Jesus Christ as a single person, in whom the pre-existent divine Logos and humanity were blended in the unity of life. Tatian and theophilus of Antioch teach essentially the same Logos theory, but Tatian with a leaning to Gnosticism, which separated the ideal Christ from the historical. Athenagoras very clearly ascribes to the Logos the creation of all things, and likewise takes the word in the double sense of the immanent reason of God and the creative word of God. Irenaeus of Lyons (d. 202), the profoundest and soundest among the ante-Nicene Fathers, views the Son of God as the essential, hypostatic Word, eternally spoken or begotten by the Father. He gives to the Logos the right to be called the Interpreter of God. As regards the essential unity of the Son and Father, the human nature of Christ, and its relation to the divine nature, he comes nearest to the Nicene standard of orthodoxy. The Alexandrian school was alike affected by Johannine, Philonic, and Platonic ideas. Clement of Alexandria views the Son as the Logos of the Father, the eternal Intelligence and Wisdom, the Fountain of all truth and knowledge, the Revealers of the Divine Being, the Creator of the world, the Educator of men. He removes all idea of subordination, and hence dislikes the term λόγος σπηνικτικός, as he regards the Logos as the creative and speaking, not the spoken, Word. Origin (d. 252) emphasizes on the one hand the eternity (eternal generation) of the Logos, and on the other his subordination to the Father; so that he gave aid and comfort both to the orthodox and the Arians schools in the Nicene age, and was quoted by both. He even applies the term υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ to the Son, declaring him equal in substance with the Father; but, on the other hand, he speaks of a difference of essence (ἐνυφέρον τῆς οὐσίας, ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπερούσιου), and calls the Logos "a second God" (δεύτερος θεός) and "God" (θεός without the article); while the Father is "the God (ὁ θεός) and "God himself" (αὐτός, i.e., God himself). In the Nicene age, through the influence chiefly of the great Athanasius, Basil, and the two Gregorys (of Nazianzus and of Nyssa), the development of the Logos doctrine ended in the triumph of the homoousian or Nicene view of the essential unity and personal distinction of the Son and the Father. Gregory of Nazianzus was called "the theologian" in the narrowest sense of that word, as the defender of the divinity of the Logos (ὁ λόγος = θεός, John i. 1), on account of the famous sermons which he preached in the Church of Constantinople. (Comp. Christology.)


Philip Schaff.

Löhe, Johann Konrad Wilhelm, one of the most remarkable of the workers in the department of practical Christianity in our century; was b. Feb. 21, 1808, in Furth, near Nürnberg; d. Jan. 2, 1872, in Neuendettelsau.1 He studied

[1 So Heroux. Usually spelled Neuendettelsau. — Ed.]
at the University of Erlangen, where he was much influenced by the pious professor, Kraft, and spent a term in Berlin. In 1831 he became vicar at Kirchenlamitz, and attracted large congregations from the surrounding country by his quiet and fervent preaching. The spiritual authorities, regarding his fervor as religious mysticism, removed him from his position. Shortly afterwards he was appointed assistant pastor of St. Egidia in Nürnberg. Here he had a brilliant career as preacher, and, like a prophet of old, denounced sin without fear. In 1837 he was made pastor in Neuendettelsau, an considerable and unattractive place. Löhe, however, learned to admire it, and transformed the town into a busy Christian colony,—a city set on a hill, the rays of whose Christian and philanthropic fervor have gone out over two hemispheres. At this period his mind was much concerned about his relations with the Bavarian Church, which he felt did not understand, much less care for, the religious wants of the people. He thought seriously of separating himself from its communion; but other counsels prevailed, and he remained a Lutheran pastor. His Besten Bücher von der Kirche ("Three Books on the Church"), which were published in 1845, represent the severest Lutheran orthodoxy.

Löhe was a philanthropist of remarkably fertile and creative talent. His special work he began about the year 1840, by interesting himself in the condition of the Germans in the United States. He helped to found the Missouri synod, and afterwards organized the Iowa synod on a different basis. He erected in Neuendettelsau two spacious buildings for the training of missionaries for the Germans in foreign lands. In 1849 he founded the Lutheran Society of Home Missions, and in 1853 an institution of deaconesses, which was the eighteenth in point of date, but has the third position in regard to numbers, in Germany. The following year the building for the deaconesses was dedicated. Around this centre there grew up with wonderful rapidity a number of important institutions, such as an asylum for idiots, a Magdalene asylum, hospitals for men and women, etc. These institutions are all accomplishing a good work. Löhe represented a most genial type of piety. Sin and grace, justification and sanctification, were the central points of his theology. As a preacher, he was among the greatest of the century. Originality of conception, vivid imagination, and prophetic fervor, were his chief characteristics in the pulpit; to which he added in his later years a profound knowledge of, and a rare fertility in, the application of Scripture. Perhaps his best collections of sermons are Sieben Predigten (1868), Predigten u. d. Vaterunser (1857), Sieben Vorträge u. d. Worte Jesu am Kreuze (1859, 2d edition, 1868). Löhe was a man of striking appearance. His head was large, his forehead high; his mouth made the impression of great decision of character; his voice was powerful, and his eye bright and searching. He was a diligent author, and wrote some 150 works, one of which, Samenkörner, has seen twenty-nine editions. See Wilhelm Löhe’s Leben, Gütersloh, 1873 sqq., by Deinzer (the inspector of the missionary institution in Neuendettelsau), in three volumes.

LOLLARDS.

LOLLARDS, a title applied to the followers of Wiclif in England, though the term was previously used of sectaries in Germany. Hoessen of Liege (1548) speaks of "guidan hypocrite gyrovagqi qui Lollardi sive Deum laudantes vocantur." His derivation, which would connect the word with the root which we have in lullaby, and makes the term equivalent to canters, is probably correct. Wiclif during his lifetime sent out itinerant preachers, who met with considerable acceptance among the people. The chief centre of Wiclif’s teaching was the University of Oxford; and, after the condemnation of Wiclif’s doctrine of the sacraments in 1382, Archbishop Courtenay proceeded to silence the Wiclifite teachers in the university. A strong academical party resisted the archbishop’s interference, but the crown supported the archbishop. The chancellor of the university was forced to submit to the publication by the archbishop’s commissary of the condemnation of Wiclif’s doctrines. The chief Lollard teachers—Lawrence Bedeman, Philip Repington, and John Astor—were driven to recant. The more famous Nicholas Hareford, who worked with Wiclif in the translation of the Bible, made his escape from England. Archbishop Courtenay in the space of five months reduced to silence the Lollard party in Oxford, and secured the orthodoxy of the university.

This result was largely due to the re-action against novelities which was produced by the Peasants’ Rising, under Wat Tyler, in 1381. Wiclif’s political opinions were expressed somewhat crudely, and lent themselves to a socialistic interpretation, though Wiclif himself had no such views. Moreover, John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, patronized Wiclif through political antagonism to William of Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester, and other prelates who acted as ministers of Edward III. Hence the Lollard movement wore at the beginning a political aspect, which it never lost, and which weakened its religious significance. After Wiclif’s death, Hareford resumed his office as itinerant preacher, and was assisted by Astor and John Purvey. The party of the Lollards grew in numbers and in boldness. In 1387 one Peter Pateshull, an Augustinian monk, abandoned his order, joined the Lollards, and openly preached in London against monasticism.

Still the Lollard party owed much of its strength to powerful courtiers who were willing to use it as a means of striking at the political power of the prelates; and during the absence of Richard II. in Ireland, in 1394, a petition of the Lollards, attacking the Church, was presented to Parliament. This document must be regarded as the exposition of their opinions (cf. Fasciculi Zizaniorum, 360–369). Its twelve articles set forth that the Church of England, following its stepmother, the Church of Rome, was eaten up by temporal pride; that its clergy had deviated from the example of Christ and the apostles; that the celibacy of the clergy occasioned much scandal, and that the belief in transubstantiation caused idolatry. It protested against exorcisms and benedictions of lifeless objects, against the holding of secular office by priests, against special prayers for the dead, pilgrimages, auricular confession,
and vows of chastity. To these points concerning ecclesiastical polity were added a protest against war as contrary to the gospel, and against unnecessary trades which were exercised only for the satisfaction of luxury. There is in these proposals a crude scheme for the reform of the Church and State; but no definite basis is laid down, and the points insisted on are arbitrarily chosen. Richard II. considered the petition as dangerous; he returned from Ireland, and exacted from the chief men of the Lollard party an oath of abjuration of their opinions. Again there was no basis of belief strong enough to resist, and the movement collapsed as suddenly as it began.

This was the highest point of Lollardism in England; and its influence is seen in such literary productions as The Plowman's Tale, and Pierce the Plowman's Crede, both of which were written about this time. It was, however, only natural that the ecclesiastical authorities, who had been so openly menaced by the petition to Parliament, should think of retaliation and repression. Thomas Arundel, who succeeded Courtenay as archbishop of Canterbury in 1396, showed himself a decided opponent of the Lollards. In 1397 he laid before a provincial synod eighteen articles taken out of the writings of Wiclif, and they were all formally condemned. The condemnation of the council was further supported from a literary side by a polemical tractate (Contra errores Wicelii in Triialogo) from the pen of a learned Franciscan, William Woodford. But the political troubles of the end of the reign of Richard II. threw religious controversy into the background. In 1398 Archbishop Arundel had to flee from England; and when he returned it was as the chief adviser of Henry of Lancaster, who came to the throne under many obligations to Arundel and to the Church.

Accordingly the convocation of 1399 petitioned Henry IV. to proceed against the Lollards. Archbishop Arundel had not much difficulty in raising feeling against them. The popular hatred of Richard II.'s rule was still strong, and the chief favorers of the Lollards had been amongst Richard's courtiers. Henry IV. was fervently orthodox, and was bound by many ties to the clerical party: he probably was not sorry to dissociate himself from his father's intrigues with the Lollard party. The convocation of 1399 framed a strong petition against the Lollards. It pointed out that the episcopal jurisdiction was powerless to suppress the itinerant preachers, unless supported by the royal power. It besought the royal assistance against all who preached, held meetings, taught schools, or, without episcopal license, disseminated books contrary to the doctrines of the Church. The petition was granted by the king with the assent of the lords, and a short petition of the Commons declared also their assent. A clause ("de hereticorum comburendo") was inserted in the statute for the year: it empowered the bishops to arrest and punish without being a heretic. And imprison him for three months, during which time proceedings were to be taken against him. If he were convicted, he might be imprisoned further, or fined for his offence: if he refused to abjure, he was to be given over to the bishop to be burned.

Thus the punishment of death for matters of opinion was for the first time introduced into the laws of England. But, while this statute was being passed, WILLIAM SATURE, a priest of the city of London, who had previously defended the Lollard, but relapsed, was brought to trial before convocation, and was condemned. As the statute was not yet law, Sature was put to death under the king's writ, which was issued on Feb. 26, 1401. Sature was the first Lollard martyr. John Purvey was brought to trial about the same time; but he recanted, and read a public confession of his errors at St. Paul's Cross.

Public opinion had now turned against the Lollards, and the bishops proceeded with their inquisitions against them. But little results followed; and the growing discontent against Henry IV. gave the Lollards again a political color, and brought their social opinions into greater prominence. In the Parliament of 1406 a petition was presented by the Commons, and was supported by the Prince of Wales. It set forth that the Lollards were threatening the foundations of society by attacking the rights of property, while they stirred up political discontent by spreading stories that Richard II. was still alive: it asked that all officers possessing jurisdiction should arrest Lollards, and present them to Parliament for punishment. The king assented; but, for some unknown reason, the petition never became a statute, probably owing to the jealousy existing between spiritual and secular courts. The bishops do not seem to have exercised their statutory powers with harshness. WILLIAM THORPE was arrested by Archbishop Arundel in 1407, and was several times examined by him; but we do not find that he was condemned to death. Thorpe wrote accounts of his examinations; which were collected by his friends, and form an interesting record of this phase of English ecclesiastical history (printed in Foxe's Acts and Monuments).

In 1409 Archbishop Arundel issued a series of constitutions against the Lollards, with the object of enforcing in detail the provisions of the statute of 1401: still the Lollards seem to have had some influence. In the Parliament of 1410 a petition was presented by the Commons, which, however, they afterwards asked to withdraw, praying for a modification of the statute of 1401, and asking that persons arrested under it should be admitted to bail. In the same Parliament the Lollard party submitted a wild proposal for the confiscation of the lands of bishops and ecclesiastical corporations, and the endowment out of them of new earls, knights, esquires, and hospitals. Whenever the Lollards had an opportunity of raising their voice publicly, they gave their enemies a handle against them by the extravagance of their political proposals.

During the session of this Parliament the first execution of a Lollard, under the statute of 1401, took place: JOHN BADDY, a tailor of Evesham, was examined by the Bishop of Worcester for erroneous doctrine concerning the Eucharist. He was brought to London, and was further examined by the archbishop and several suffragans. In spite of all their persuasions, he remained firm in his statement that the bread and wine of the sacrament of the altar remained bread and wine after consecration, though the partakers were members of the living God. On March 5, 1410, he was condemned as a heretic, and was led to Smithfield.
for execution. The Prince of Wales, who was present, tried at the last moment to induce Badby to recant: his efforts were in vain. But it would seem that the first execution under the act was regarded with regret even by those who thought it absolutely necessary.

Meanwhile the triumph of orthodoxy in the University of Oxford was complete. Its theologians exercised their ingenuity by a close examination of Wiclif's writings; and in 1412 no fewer than two hundred and sixty-seven conclusions drawn from his works were condemned as erroneous. This condemnation was important; as it provided materials ready to hand for the theologians of heresy. Oldcastle himself escaped, and was drawn from his works were condemned as erroneous. But it would seem that he had not the same reverence for the orthodoxy of the Church as Henry V. had for his own; and in 1412 no fewer than two hundred and sixty-seven conclusions drawn from his works were condemned as erroneous. This condemnation was important; as it provided materials ready to hand for the theologians of the Council of Constance, who struck at Wiclif as the first step towards striking at Hus.

On the accession of Henry V. (1413), Archbishop Arundel was relieved of his office of chancellor, and had more time to proceed against the Lollards. Before the convocation of 1413 he laid a proposal to root out Lollardy from high places, and it was resolved that measures be taken to reduce to obedience the chief favorites of heresy. As the first victim of this new policy, a Herefordshire knight, Sir John Oldcastle, was selected. Oldcastle had considerable possessions, which he increased by marriage with the heiress of the barony of Cobham, who held large lands in Kent. After his marriage, Oldcastle was summoned to the House of Lords as Lord Cobham. Oldcastle was an earnest Lollard. He sheltered itinerant preachers, attended their services, and openly spoke against some of the church ritual. Oldcastle was an earnest Lollard. He sheltered itinerant preachers, attended their services, and openly spoke against some of the church ritual. In 1410 his chaplain was suspended by Arundel for irregularities in the conduct of church services. Oldcastle was formally presented by convocation to the king as a heretic; and Henry V. first tried by personal solicitations to win him back. But Oldcastle refused to sign these declarations, and openly avowed Lollard opinions. He was con-demned as a heretic, but was allowed a respite till the religious persecutions of the next century were carried out. From this time forward, we find the Lollards deprived of any influential leaders. The French war of Henry V. provided occupation for the classes who were willing to use the help of the Lollards in attacking the prelates, and the universities were peaceful. The Lollards could no longer claim to be a party within the English Church: they had become a sect outside it.

The teaching of Wiclif, meanwhile, had taken deeper root in Bohemia than in England; and the sturdiness of the party that gathered round Hus contrasts markedly with the indecision of the English Lollards. From Oxford went Lollards to Bohemia; some bearing a letter which purported to be a defence of Wiclif, signed by the chancellor and an assembly of masters. There can be little doubt that the letter was a forgery. Most famous amongst these Hussite-Lollards was Peter Payne, who also bore many other names. He was the son of a French father, had some reputation in Oxford, and rose to eminence amongst the Bohemians. He was one of the disputants on the Hussite side at the Council of Basel in 1433, and his polemical cleverness often degenerated into sophistry. He died in Prague in 1455.

The attempt at revolution in which Oldcastle was involved decided Henry V. to take stronger measures against the Lollards. In the Parliament of 1414 an act was passed which went far beyond that of 1401; for it laid down the principle, that heresy was an offence against the common law, as well as an offence against the canon law. Besides re-enacting with greater severity the provisions of the statute of 1401, it ordered all justices to inquire after heretics, and hand them over for trial to the spiritual courts. This was the final statute against the Lollards, and under it the religious persecutions of the next century were carried out. From this time forward, we find the Lollards deprived of any influential leaders. The French war of Henry V. provided occupation for the classes who were willing to use the help of the Lollards in attacking the prelates, and the universities were peaceful. The Lollards could no longer claim to be a party within the English Church: they had become a sect outside it.

The teaching of Wiclif, meanwhile, had taken deeper root in Bohemia than in England; and the sturdiness of the party that gathered round Hus contrasts markedly with the indecision of the English Lollards. From Oxford went Lollards to Bohemia; some bearing a letter which purported to be a defence of Wiclif, signed by the chancellor and an assembly of masters. There can be little doubt that the letter was a forgery. Most famous amongst these Hussite-Lollards was Peter Payne, who also bore many other names. He was the son of a French father, had some reputation in Oxford, and rose to eminence amongst the Bohemians. He was one of the disputants on the Hussite side at the Council of Basel in 1433, and his polemical cleverness often degenerated into sophistry. He died in Prague in 1455.

The statute of 1414 seems to have answered its purpose of checking the open dissemination of Lollard doctrines. Reforming priests no longer preached openly; though conventicles were sometimes held secretly, and Lollard books were circulated. Persecutions were frequent, but executions were rare. Besides the thirty-eight who were put to death after Oldcastle's rising in 1414, we only know the names of twenty-eight others who suffered death. The gentry of the country, after a few made a recantation, and submitted to penance. In 1427 Pope Martin V. ordered the Bishop of
Lincoln to carry out the decree of the Council of Constance against Wiclif's remains as those of a condemned heretic. They were accordingly dug out of the churchyard at Lutterworth, and thrown into the Avon. In 1431 an attempted rebellion of the political Lollards was made under a condemned heretic. They were accordingly thrown into the Avon. In 1431 an attempted attempt to enforce the Lollard principles in politics, and the disturbed state of England in the dynastic struggle between the rival houses of York and Lancaster diverted political discontent to other objects. After 1431 we hear less of the Lollards, and the prosecutions against them became rarer.

It is not very easy to determine with precision what were the religious tenets of the Lollards. The results of their examinations before the bishops show us a number of men discontented to other objects. After 1431 we hear less of the bishops show us a number of men discontented to other objects. After 1431 we hear less of the bishops show us a number of men discontented to other objects. After 1431 we hear less of the bishops show us a number of men discontented to other objects. After 1431 we hear less of the bishops show us a number of men discontented to other objects. After 1431 we hear less of the bishops show us a number of men discontented to other objects. After 1431 we hear less of the bishops show us a number of men discontented to other objects. After 1431 we hear less of the bishops show us a number of men discontented to other objects. After 1431 we hear less of the bishops show us a number of men discontented to other objects. After 1431 we hear less of the bishops show us a number of men discontented to other objects. After 1431 we hear less of the bishops show us a number of men discontented to other objects. After 1431 we hear less of the bishops show us a number of men discontented to other objects. After 1431 we hear less of the bishops show us a number of men discontented to other objects.
account from the ecclesiastical side is to be found in Lechler: Johann von Wiclif und die Vorgeschichte der Reformation, 2 Bde., Leipzig, 1879. The first volume has been translated with additional notes by Lohner: John Wiclif and his English Predecessors, London, 1878, 2 vols., new edition, 1882, 1 vol. The fullest account from the political side is given by Stubbs: The Constitutional History of England, vols. 2 and 3, Oxford, 1875—80.

LOMBARDS (Longobardi, or Langobardi, "the long-bearded"), The, a Teutonic tribe, seem to have come from the northern part of Jutland, and were settled on the left shore of the Lower Elb, when, in 5 A.D., they were attacked by the Romans. They were reputed brave, but the tribe was small. Towards the close of the fourth century they moved through Upper Silesia, Bohemia, and Moravia; and towards the close of the fifth century they were settled on the left bank of the Danube, from the mouth of the Em to Vienna. In 526 they crossed the Danube, and penetrated into Pannonia; and in 568 they entered Italy. The conquest of the country took many years, and was carried out in a most cruel and merciless manner. It was never completed, however. The regions around Rome and Naples, Sicily and the southern part of the peninsula, the Venetian islands, and the coast from the mouth of the Po to Ancona, remained in the possession of the Byzantines. The advance was repeatedly checked by the intrigues of the Pope, whose policy during that period it was to keep Italy weak and divided in order to increase his own power. The Lombard Empire was finally destroyed by Charles Magne in 774, and all its dominions incorporated with the Frankish Empire.

When the Lombards entered Italy, they were, to some extent, Pagans. The Christians among them were Arians. It seems, however, that the Church did not suffer any thing from them; and very soon her successful exertions for their conversion began. Theodolinda, a Bavarian princess, — married first to King Authal'is, and then to King Agilulf, — belonged to the Catholic Church, and maintained an intimate friendship with Gregory the Great. She built the magnificent basilica at Monza, and dedicated it to St. John the Baptist, who afterwards became the patron saint of the Lombards. In 612, still in the reign of Agilulf, the monastery of Bobbio was founded in the Cottian Alps by Columbanus, and munificently endowed by the king and his son Adolald. Under Gundeberge, the daughter of Theodolinde, and, like her, married successively to two Lombard kings, — Ariowlald, who died in 636; and Rothari, who died in 652, — all traces of Paganism and Arianism disappeared from among the people; and the Lombards now showed themselves as energetic in their religious faith as formerly in their warlike enthusiasm. In the eighth century numerous churches and monasteries were built, and all ecclesiastical institutions were magnificently provided for.

Meanwhile the political relations between the Lombard kings and the Romans became more and more strained. Gregory III. (731—741) addressed himself to Charles Martell, major domus at the Merovingian Court, and asked for aid against Liutprand; but at that moment the relations between the Franks and the Lombards were very friendly. Stephen III. (753—757) went in person to Gaul, anointed Pepin, and declared Charles and Carloman, kings of the Franks; and in 754 and 755 Pepin made two campaigns in Italy, and compelled Aistulf to surrender his conquests. Under Desiderius an alliance was formed between the Franks and the Lombards, which seemed likely to prove fatal to the plans of the Pope. But when Charlemagne repudiated the daughter of Desiderius, and the latter gave support to Carloman's widow and children, the alliance turned into a bitter feud; and in 773 Adrian I. found a willing ear when he asked Charlemagne for aid. See Monumenta germaniae hist. scriptores rerum Langobardicorum et Ital. sac., 6—9, Hanover, 1878.

LOMBARDS, Petrus, called Magister Sententiarum ("Master of Sentences"), from being the author of the Books of Sentences, was b. in the early part of the twelfth century, in Novara, Lombardy; d. in Paris, July 20, 1180. He was of obscure birth. After studying at Bologna, he went to Rheims, where he continued his studies, his maintenance being provided for by Bernard of Clairvaux. From there he went to Paris, with letters from Bernard to the convent of St. Victor. He became a distinguished teacher, and most probably a canon of St. Victor. In 1150 he was elevated to the see of Paris, which he lived to administer only a single year. Of the facts of his life nothing further is known. An incident is told to illustrate his humility, to the effect, that, on the day of his consecration as bishop, his mother was induced by some noblemen to appear against her wishes, in finer attire than she was accustomed to wear at Novara; but her son refused to recognize her till she had exchanged it for her usual rustic dress.

Peter's fame rests upon his literary works, and more particularly upon his Four Books of Sentences (Libri quatuor sententiarum). In this work he places himself in sympathy with the ruling tendencies of the time, — the ecclesiastical and positive, and the speculative. The former was concerned with the teachings of the Church and the Fathers; the latter — the truths of the Church, understood by the Fathers, which was one of the principal objects of Peter's work. Peter's main authority is Augustine. He differs from Abelard, likewise, in seeking to arrange his matter systematically. His was not the first collection of sentences. Hugo of St. Victor (d. 1135), Robert Pulleyrn (d. 1150), and others had preceded him in this department. Nor can his work be regarded as the most valuable of its kind.

The first book of the Sentences treats (in forty-eight distinctiones, or chapters) of God. The author's definition of the Trinity exposed him to
LORD.

the charge of heresy. Joachim of Fiore (d. 1202) declares he had taught a quaternity. The matter was brought before the Lateran Council of 1215; and Lombard was acquitted, it being shown that he had simply distinguished between the divine essence and the three persons, but had in nowise constituted a fourth person in the Godhead. In the second book (forty-four chapters) created things. Of man's origin as state from sin by the love to God which the manifestation of God's love in the death of Christ excites.

Claring for seven as the proper number. The second book discusses (in forty-four chapters) the author discusses the incarnation, redemption, and the virtues of human character. In the doctrine of the work of Christ he contents himself with presenting the different views, but shows a leaning to the theory of Abelard, according to which we are made free commentator of the Pauline Epistles.

A Commentary on the Psalms (first printed at Paris in 1533, and most recently in Migne), and the work was used for many years as a textbook at the universities, and was extensively commented upon. Commentaries continued to be written upon it after the Reformation, especially in Spain, Italy, and Germany, preparing himself for the chair of modern languages at Bowdoin. From Bowdoin he was called in 1835 to succeed George Ticknor as professor of modern languages and literature at Harvard University. After another year passed in study and travel abroad, he entered upon his duties at Cambridge. From this time his career was as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day. Voices of the Night (1839), especially the Psalm of Life, may be said to have struck the keynote of his poetical fame, and at once made him known wherever the English tongue was spoken. Hyperion, a prose romance, appeared in the same year. Among his principal works that followed are Ballads and other Poems, and Poems on Slavery (1842), The Spanish Student (1843), Evangeline, a Tale of Acadie (1847), The Seaside and the Fireside (1850), The Golden Legend (1851), The Song of Hiawatha (1855), The Courtship of Miles Standish (1858), Tales of a Wayfaring Inn (1869), a translation of The Divine Comedy, and New-England Tragedies (1869), The Divine Tragedy (1871), The Hanging of the Crane (1874), and Moriutur Salutamus, a very touching poem read at the fiftieth anniversary of his college class. Not long after settling at Cambridge, he purchased the-Craigie house, celebrated as the headquarters of Washington; and here he continued to reside until his death, the centre of a domestic and social circle known far and wide for its virtues, refinement, and literary attractions. In 1864 he resigned his professorship, and in 1868-80 travelled again in Europe, everywhere meeting with friends and admirers. The University of Oxford conferred upon him at this time the degree of D.C.L.

Longfellow's poetical works have had a very wide circulation in Great Britain, as well as at home: numerous translations of them have also been made into other languages. He endeared himself to the public not less by his character than by his genius. The man was quite as much honored and beloved as the poet. Nor is this strange. He touches the chords of human feeling and sympathy with such skill, because he touches them with the hand of a brother. Having himself taken deep lessons in the school of life,—lessons of great sorrow and suffering, as well as of joy,—he knows how to help and cheer others who are learning the same lessons.

"Such songs have power to quiet The restless pulse of care, And come like the benediction Which follows after prayer."—

G. L. PRENTIS.

LONGOBARDS. See Lombards.

LORD, as a term of address to a divinity, is the rendering of the Vulgate Version for four Hebrew and two Greek words. (1) יְהֹוָה (Jehovah); which see. (2) Λόρδον ("Adon"). The term is exactly translated "lord," and is only rarely applied to God (Ps. viii. 1); usually to an earthly master, as a husband (Gen. xviii. 12),
ruler of slaves (Gen. xxiv. 14), or a king (Gen. xiv. 8). It is often used with the possessive

pronom, my lord. (9) νῦν ("Adonai", plural of "Adon") not usually applied to God in the histo-

tical books, for it is used therein only fourteen times alone (e.g., Gen. xvii., 8., and thirteen times in connection with "Jehovah" (e.g., Gen. xv.) nor used at all in Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canti-

cles. (4) מִצְכָּר ("Maré"), used only in the Book of Daniel, addressed to a king, but also to God (ii. 47, v. 23). (5) Κύριος ("Kurios"), is the Septuagint and New Testament translation of Jehovah, also applied to Christ. (6) Δεσπότης ("Despotés"), a master (Luke ii. 29). In regard to these it should be remarked that they differ too widely to admit of one translation in common. Espe-

cially should Jehovah be uniformly used of the Supreme Being wherever such term occurs in the original. Mr. Wright (art. Lord, in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible) thus speaks of the typo-

graphical arrangement in the English Bible: "The difference between 'Jehovah' and 'Adon-

ai' lies in a general Authorized Version by printing the word in small capitals (LORD) when it represents the former (Gen. xv. 4, etc.), and with an initial capital only when it is the translation of the latter (Ps. xvii. 5, etc.), except in Exod. xxiii. 17, xxxiv. 23, where the Lord God should be more consis-
tently 'the Lord Jehovah,' a clear distinction prevails between מִצְכָּר (the letters of 'Jehovah,' with the vowel-points of 'El-ohim') and דֵּוָּר ("El-ohim"); the former being represented in the Authorized Version by 'God' in small capitals (Gen. xv. 2, etc.), while 'El-ohim' is 'God' with an initial capital only. And generally, when the name of the deity is printed in capitals, it indicates that the corresponding Hebrew is מִצְכָּר, which is translated 'Lord,' or 'God,' according to the vowel-points by which it is accompanied.

LORD, Nathan, D.D., LL.D., b. at Eriwick, Me., Nov. 28, 1783; d. at Hanover, N.H., Sept. 8, 1870. He was graduated at Bowdoin College, 1809, and at Andover Theological Seminary, 1812; entered the Congregational ministry; and after twelve years of pastoral labor at Amherst, N.H., was president of Dartmouth College from Oct. 25, 1828, to July, 1863. His presidency was able, dignified, and successful. His publications were mostly articles in periodicals. Two published Letters to Ministers of the Gospel of all Denomina-
tions (1854-55) deserve mention for their defence of slavery on biblical grounds. They occasioned much debate.

LORD'S DAY, the oldest and best designation of the Christian Sabbath; first used by St. John, Rev. i. 10 (κυριαρχικόν εἰκόνα). See SABBATH, SUN-

DAY.

LORD'S PRAYER. The. Our Lord, at the re-
quest of his disciples, imitated the Baptist, and taught them a prayer, which was to be the pattern of all prayer in his name. This prayer should not be allowed to degenerate into a mere formula, nor be frequently repeated in service, — a practice contradictory to the substance and object of the prayer. The Lord's Prayer is twice given in the New Testament (Matt. vi. 9-13; Luke xi. 2-4), in slightly differing words.

It has frequently been discussed whether Matthew or Luke has the correct form, or whether Jesus did not really teach it twice. The last sup-

position is improbable. It is, however, likely that Matthew inserted the prayer in his report of the Sermon on the Mount. Equally probable are the discussions relative to the sources of the prayer. John Lightfoot and others maintain that it was extracted, petition for petition, from rabbinical prayers. But the proof aduced reduces itself to this, that, in these latter prayers, God is sometimes called 'Father.' It is indeed, in the Old Testament: cf. Duet. xxxii. 3; Job xx. 26, marg.; Isa. xiii. 16; Jer. iii. 4, 39; Mal. i. 6), the restoration of the kingdom of Israel is plead-
ed for; and the petition occurs, 'Hallowed be thy name through our works.' The remaining peti-
tions have been found in a prayer-book in use among Portuguese Jews of the middle ages, and in another composed by a rabbi, Klatz, about 1500 A.D. Surely our Lord did not borrow from these. The best refutation of the idea of compilation is the Lord's Prayer itself, so symmetrical in arrange-
ment, so progressive in its thought, and so inex-
haustible in its depth.

"Our Father who art in heaven," so the prayer begins. For the first time is God called the Father of particular persons. In the Old-Testament paralles he is the Father of the people of Israel; and Elihu alone (Job xxxiv. 36, marg.) calls him "Father" in the personal sense. In the New Testament, God appears as our Father in Christ; for, since he is the Father of Christ, he is the Father of those who are in Christ (John i. 12).

"Our Father" is thus the express opposite to the heathen idea of "the father of gods and men," an epithet frequently applied; e.g., by Homer to Zeus. "Heaven" is the residence of God, that part of his creation wherein neither sin nor death is found, wherein his will is perfectly fulfilled: in short, where live the unfallen angels and the perfectly holy, in sight of the uncovered glory of God. The clause "in heaven" reminds us of the holiness of God to whom we pray; the epithet "Father," of his condescending grace.

The first petition is, "Hallowed be thy name." This properly comes first, because to give God the glory which is his due is the first and supreme desire of the Christian. God does not exist for us, but for himself: we are the creatures of his bounty. His "name" is Jehovah, — the sacred name by which he revealed himself. This name expresses his Godhead. To "hallow" it means to declare that he is God from all eternity, that he is holy, and demands holiness in his creatures, and that we are what we are in consequence of his grace. The Christian prays, not only for power himself to glorify God, but that the glory of God may be acknowledged by the whole world.

The second petition is, "Thy kingdom come." The "kingdom" is that which the Lord will set up on his return. The petition is, therefore, not for personal fitness to enter the kingdom, but for the completion of the work of redemption. Im-
plied is, of course, the request that this work of this world may not hinder the progress of Mes-
iah's kingdom. It is true they cannot, yet God means that we should pray that they may not.

The third petition is, "Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth." It brings us face to face with the contrast between the perfect obedience of heaven and the repeated rebellion of earth.
That the latter may cease, the Christian desires. In this petition he requests sincerely, first his own disobedience, and then that of the whole earth, and implores God to give strength to him, and grace to his fellows, to do the will of God.

These first three petitions contain a reference to the triune nature of God. God, whose name is to be hallowed, is the Father of Jesus Christ, the Lord and Creator of all things. His future kingdom is also the kingdom of the Father, but setup to the present constitueld, viz., to the present deliverance from guilt, the forgiveness of sins. What separates us from the kingdom of Christ is our sins; this wall of partition must be daily removed by renewed supplication for the forgiveness once for all effected by Christ. The "as" in the petition is not "because:" our forgiveness of others does not merit God's forgiveness of us; rather it points to the conduct we must show, if we really would enjoy God's grace.

The sixth petition is, "And bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one." Augustine and the Lutheran divines divide this petition into two: Chrysostom and the Reformed divines consider it a unit. The first clause does indeed express positively what the second does negatively, for so one is at liberty to consider them separately, but they are closely connected. "Ο πατήρ ὁ ἐν συνεργίᾳ τῷ ἔχθρῳ, ὁ Σατάν. The adjective πατήρ never means simple sinfulness as such, much less "evil" generally, but always that wickedness which is Antichrist, working directly against the salvation which is in Christ Jesus. The adjective is either always connected with some substantive, or else, if absolute, is the masculine, and signifies a person, namely, Satan (cf. Matt. v. 37). The word "temptation" means both trial, and also actual temptation to sin. But God tempts no one to sin. Yet he does place his children in circumstances of trial; but these trials are wholesome, and no Christian seeks deliverance from them. The temptation in them arises from our sinful hearts. The petition therefore means, from such temptations above that we "are able" may God deliver us. He surely will (1 Cor. x. 13); but he wants to be asked to do so. The petition is a recognition that we contend, not against flesh and blood, but against the Evil One, and therefore stand in dire need of the divine help. We pray to be delivered from all temptations to leave our Saviour, or to decline in our faith and love (in this way the sixth is parallel to the third petition), and also that these trials be finally delivered, and the victory of Christ be made complete.

The doxology is decidedly spurious; yet it is beautiful and fitting: it would even better correspond to the double triadic arrangement of the prayer, if the "power" were made to precede the "kingdom." Liturgical use of the prayer can be traced as early as the end of the third century, in Tertullian and Cyprian; and then the doxology was in use, giving it a better liturgical close.


EBBARD.
of me. In like manner also [he took] the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood; this do, as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. The first question concerns the words, "in my blood." Do they refer to the "cup," or the "covenant"? We should read, The new covenant in (by means of) my blood? or, This cup is in my blood the new covenant? Plainly the latter. The cup is the new covenant in Christ's blood; as of the death of Jesus, as Paul himself says: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come." The accounts of Matthew and Mark add little. Peculiar to Matthew is the connection between the shedding of the blood and the forgiveness of sins (xxvi. 28). Matthew and Mark relate that all present drank of the cup; the first, that it was done at the request of Jesus. All four unite in declaring, that, through the blood of Christ, a new covenant has been made. This blood was not, however, shed for all, but "for many" (παντίς πολλῶν); although the expression implies that the number thereby blessed is very large.

The decisive question, after all, is, Are the words, "This is my body," "This is my blood," literal, or symbolical? Was there an actual presentation of the body and blood of Christ? or was there only one in simile? The decision rests upon the parallel position of subject and predicate. No emphasis should be put upon "is," for Luke omits it in respect to the cup, without thereby altering the sense; nor is it of importance to state passively or in which such a parallelism exists, and where predicate or subject is figurative (e.g., Matt. xiii. 38, 39; John xv. 1, 5); because for the Lord to introduce illustrations and similes into his instruction or discourses is one thing, and quite another to use them in a solemn hour when he established a new ordinance through the presentation of gifts which he named. In the latter case there was no instruction, or explanation of a subject, through an illustration, but a description of what the disciples took from his hand, and should eat and drink. To suppose that our Lord at such a time spoke in metaphor is contrary to the solemnity of the occasion, the meaning of the institution, and the short, precise phrases employed. Problematical and mysterious the words were, doubtless; but the disciples were used to this, and their faith would not be shaken thereby, but rather deepened and strengthened through the expectation of a fresh experience of his might. Nay, our Lord called what he gave them his body and his blood; and no circumstance leads us to suppose they were anything else. The question now arises, whether, upon the utterance of these words, the bread and wine were changed into the body and blood of Christ? The answer is found in 1 Cor. x. 16: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?" Paul says these three things: (1) The bread and wine are not changed into other substances, but they are a veritable communion of the body and blood of Christ; (2) This communion is given with the bread and wine, and is inseparable from it; (3) The means of enjoying this communion is the partaking of the elements in a spiritual sense. Does the blood and wine of Christ pour out for us? It is further to be borne in mind, that the cup was given after the Passover meal (so Luke and Paul); so that it was not a part of the Jewish ceremony, but a new institution. It is an open question whether the giving of the bread and that of the wine were separated by an interval: at all events, the two actions are parts of one ordinance.—The words, "This do in remembrance of me," do not express the object of the sacrament, but the meaning: it is a memorial of the death of Jesus, as Paul himself says: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come." The decision rests upon "is," for Luke omits it in respect to the cup, without thereby altering the sense; nor is it of importance to state passively or in which such a parallelism exists, and where predicate or subject is figurative (e.g., Matt. xiii. 38, 39; John xv. 1, 5); because for the Lord to introduce illustrations and similes into his instruction or discourses is one thing, and quite another to use them in a solemn hour when he established a new ordinance through the presentation of gifts which he named. In the latter case there was no instruction, or explanation of a subject, through an illustration, but a description of what the disciples took from his hand, and should eat and drink. To suppose that our Lord at such a time spoke in metaphor is contrary to the solemnity of the occasion, the meaning of the institution, and the short, precise phrases employed. Problematical and mysterious the words were, doubtless; but the disciples were used to this, and their faith would not be shaken thereby, but rather deepened and strengthened through the expectation of a fresh experience of his might. Nay, our Lord called what he gave them his body and his blood; and no circumstance leads us to suppose they were anything else. The question now arises, whether, upon the utterance of these words, the bread and wine were changed into the body and blood of Christ? The answer is found in 1 Cor. x. 16: "The cup of blessing which we
of the sacrament, it means that no one can enjoy in this sacrament the bread and wine unless he does at the same time actually receive them by his mouth. But the meaning is not that the body and blood of Christ are corporeally present (impanation) in the bread and wine, nor in such a manner connected with them that they are part of the material elements, and not enter the system. On the contrary, the Lutheran Church asserts the spiritual partaking of the heavenly elements, but not as if this spiritual partaking were something different and distinct from the oral partaking, rather as proceeding at the same time, the two being supernaturally and spiritually connected. Nothing depends upon the spiritual condition of the recipient. He may receive the body and blood unworthily; and then he eats them to his own judgment (1 Cor. xi. 29), for he becomes "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord" (xi. 27), not discerning the Lord's body; i.e., not considering that being the material elements, he is at the same time receiving the body of the Lord. But this effect would not happen if the unworthy recipient partook only of bread and wine. The unworthy are all those who do not believe, who go to this sacrament without any repentance of their past sins, and sincere desire to improve their lives (Form. Conc., Epit., § 18; Sol. decl., vii. §§ 69—71).

In regard to the blessing attached to the right use of the sacrament, the Confession says, in brief, "These words, 'Given and shed for you for the forgiveness of sins,' show, that, in the sacrament, forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation are given; for, where forgiveness of sin is, there is also life and salvation."

What has been previously said may be embraced in the following propositions. (1) The words of institution are to be understood in their ordinary acceptation. Since our Lord said, "Take, eat, this is my body, my blood," his body and blood are really and truly present, and are distributed and received. (2) This reception is by the mouth, agreeably to the words of institution, because the Lord has determined no other way, but at the same time spiritually, because the body and blood of Christ are spiritual, heavenly food, which is not assimilated by the body, as earthly food would be. (3) Because the reception of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper is joined to the earthly signs, so both are received by all those who participate in the sacrament, held agreeably to the words of institution, irrespective of their worthiness or unworthiness, but to the blessing of the worthy, and to the judgment of the unworthy.

It remains now to answer certain questions. First, Is not the Roman Church right in giving the laity the bread only, inasmuch as in the bread (i.e., the body) the blessed is of the Lord's Supper? In regard to this it is sufficient to remark, that such action is plainly in flat contradiction to the words of institution, "Drink ye all of it," and also to the action of our Lord in giving the cup. But next it may be asked, What kind of body and blood is that which is of the Lord's Supper? The glorified. To this it may be objected, that the primary reference must have been to the mortal body. True; and it is the same body, but it is differently conditioned. It is now mortal, but immortal, glorified. But, if that is the case, one may further object: Then those who received the bread and wine directly from the Lord's hands did not receive the sacrament as we do, for Christ was not yet glorified. The objection is aimed at the power of Christ. The Lord, who had power to lay down his life, and power to take it again (John x. 18), in an unassimilated body and blood, the body of Christ is given. But this explanation proves that the Lutherans are not yet completely emancipated from Romanism. At the same time, it is freely granted that the Zwinglian theologians,
in their zeal against the Roman Church, went too far on the other side.

The institution of the Lord's Supper was preceded by the speech of Jesus in the synagogue at Capernaum (John vi. 48-63); and the latter, though in no way directly connected with the former, throws considerable light upon it, in that it presents an instance of figurative speaking. On both occasions there mention made of an eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ. But in his Capernaum speech, there surely was a most emphatic rejection of the literal acceptation of those words; for this was just the sense the people at Capernaum took them in. Hence the way was, to say the least, prepared for the acceptance of the figurative interpretation of the words of institution on the part of his disciples.

The Lord's Supper is no exception to the general statement that every thing in the New Testament links on to the Old, for it is directly connected with the Paschal Supper. The Lord took his farewell supper, and at the same time his Paschal Supper. But, in order to free his church from the ordinances of the Jewish dispensation, he set before his disciples bread and wine. If the partaking of the body and blood of Christ is to be spiritual, we should naturally expect, that, in the words of institution, there will be something which cannot be taken other than figuratively. And this is the case. The four accounts are divisible into two groups.—Matthew and Mark, Luke and Paul (1 Cor. xi. 28-26); and it is precisely in the second group, presumably the more authentic, if any thing, that some points present themselves which cannot be understood literally. (1) Luke's phrase, "This cup, the new covenant in my blood, that which is poured out for you;" and Paul's, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood." Some would draw "in my blood" to cup, and read, "This cup is, in consequence of my blood, symbol or pledge of the new covenant;" others, and better, with Calvin, connect the clause with "new covenant," and read "This cup, i.e., that which it contains, sets forth the new covenant, which has been formed and sealed by my blood." But in either case we have a strongly figurative expression. The Lord, under the affecting excitement of the hour, heaps figure upon figure. (2) The phrase, "This do in remembrance of me" (Paul gives it twice, after the distribution of the bread and of the wine; Luke only once). How can any one resist the impression that the phrase points directly to a figurative meaning of the supper? For "remembrance" implies absence. "To remember" a present Lord is a solecism. And the argument loses nothing of its force when we suppose the words were never spoken (as a matter of fact, they are not given in Matthew and Mark); for they prove the understanding Luke and Paul had of the supper,—that it was a parallel to the Paschal Supper, in which there was a remembrance made every year of past events. The Lutherans strive to break the force of the argument by emphasizing Paul's warning (1 Cor. xi. 27-29) against eating and drinking unworthily, saying that, since this is not against an absent object, the body and blood of Christ must be present. But the premise is false, and the conclusion invalid. One can, for example, commit an offence against a country while not in the country, as by insulting the flag of that country. Again, the Lutherans call attention to the clause, "not discerning the body," as if it implied the actual presence of the body. But it does not at all necessarily do this. Another proof passage with the Lutherans is 1 Cor. x. 16-22. Here Paul parallels the communion of the body and blood of Christ with that between the participants in the Jewish sacrifices, and with that between idolatrous sacrificers. But the communion in all three cases is, after all, not based upon the material contact, but upon the common frame of mind. So there is communion in the body and blood of Christ, because there is common belief in Christ as the Saviour from sin and guilt through death, of which the pledge has been given us in the Last Supper.

We are now in condition to take a comprehensive view of the Lord's Supper. The feet-washing which preceded its institution was a fitting prelude. It revealed the ministering love of the Lord; the supper, his yielding, sacrificing love. Love is the secret of the supper. The Lord is about to give up his life into the hands of sinners, but in truth he gives himself up into the hands of his own; for them he dies in order that they may live. Love is the motive in the sacrifice. Of this the supper is the pledge and the confirmation. It is in itself a condescension of the divine love to our human nature, spirit and body. To this fact the Fathers, the Schoolmen, and the Reformers alike call attention. On former occasions the Lord had likened participation in the kingdom of God to a meal to which they were invited: here is a meal, and one, too, in which the host offers himself as food and drink.

Thus the Lord's Supper stands upon the same plane with baptism. Both are symbolic. The latter symbolizes the grace needful to reception into the covenant of grace; the former, that for maintenance and progress in the covenant. The supper offers us nothing else than what is already offered us in the Word,—confirmation in communion with Christ, with its fruit, strengthening of faith, forgiveness of sin, and power of sanctification. But in the supper these are tenderly pressed upon us. By the eating and drinking we are admonished that he gave his body for us, for us shed his blood. Without the supper, we can surely have our strength increased, and obtain forgiveness of sin; but in the supper we receive the most solemn assurances that these mercies are ours. And the supper gives us also direct encouragement to continue in grace, and the strength so to do; so that Zwingli expressed the exact truth when he said that the supper was given to us in order that we might have heart to overcome the world, through faith in Him who overcame the world for us. The supper, is, therefore, no empty, meaningless sign; although it does not in itself confer grace.

But it is one thing to say that Christ is present in the supper, and another to say that he is present in the bread. There is in it a true and real presence of Christ; but it is a sacramental presence, not local and material, but that which makes the celebration of the Lord's Supper the crown of Christian worship. In it
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God meets man, and comes laden with richest gifts. See what a part faith plays in the supper. "Christ is with the mouth of faith received." Without faith the sign is empty, meaningless: there is no spiritual presence, only the presence of a symbol. In the faithful the supper has a blessed effect. But no miracle is necessary, simply a working of grace according to the measure of faith in the participants. And where there is no faith, there is no real presence, only a figurative presence.

The unworthy participant eats and drinks judgment: he does not and cannot receive Christ. There remains a word of historical criticism. Zwingli and Ecolampadius, driven by their polemic against Rome, surely went to extremes in reducing the sacraments to mere signs. The First Helvetic Confession (XXIII.), however, more correctly teaches, that, in the "mystical supper," the Lord gives to his own his body and blood, i.e., himself, in order that he may live in them through faith, and they in him. Calvin advances beyond Zwingli, and approaches the Lutheran view, without, however, giving up the Reformed idea. He teaches that the flesh of Christ has a perpetual life-giving power; and in the Lord's Supper the believers, through the Holy Spirit, share in this power through their participation in the substance of the glorified body of Christ. This idea was expressed in the Genevan Catechism, and in the French, Belgian, and First Scotch Confessions. Here we see a tinge of the Roman-Catholic doctrine: yet the underlying idea is correct; we must hold fast upon the human in Christ, if we would come to the divine. In the flesh of Christ lies the power of life,— in the Word made flesh, as it is embodied and lives in the word of the everlasting gospel. And in the Lord's Supper we are, besides, pointed to the death of Christ and its saving power; and thus by it, as Paul says, we show forth the Lord's death until he come. This is the doctrine of the Heidelberg Catechism, and the Second Helvetic Confession, and wherever else it is taught, that, in the Supper, the body of Christ is through faith spiritually received.

To conclude: the participation in the supper in faith strengthens our unity of life with Christ and with our fellow-believers, since this union is founded upon Christ. The Lutheran and Reformed Confessions, in spite of their differences, have much and essential matter in common, not only in the rejection of Roman-Catholic errors, but in the conception of the supper as a true means of grace, assuring our salvation, strengthening our faith, and increasing our union with Christ.


The High Anglican View is, that "the bread and wine become by consecration really and sacramentally (though in an inconceivable manner, which cannot be explained by earthly similitudes or illustrations) the body and blood of our Lord." This is the doctrine of the "real presence," in contrast to that of the "figurative presence," according to which the bread and the wine are "only memorials of Christ's body and blood," and to that of the "virtual presence," "as if our Lord only bestowed in the Eucharist the graces and blessings derived from his suffering and sacrifice." In proof are quoted our Lord's address at Capernaum (John vi.), his intercessory prayer (John xvii.), the words of institution in the Synoptists and Paul, the Fathers, and the ancient liturgies. The Eucharist is also a sacrifice; for when our Lord said, "Do this in remembrance of me," he meant, "offer it as a sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins." Hence the Eucharist is called the "unbloody sacrifice" by the Fathers and the ancient liturgies. See J. H. BLUNT: Dict. of Doctr. and Hist. Theology, arts. "Eucharist," "Real Presence." The original view of the Church of England, as expressed in the Thirty-Nine Articles, Art. XXVIII., is the Reformed or Calvinistic view. See below.

IV. The Confessional Statements respecting the Lord's Supper.

The Roman-Catholic doctrine is officially given in the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, Sess. XIII., Oct. 11, 1561. See Creeds, ii. 129-139. The principal points are:

"In the Eucharist are contained truly, really and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ." — Can. 1.

"The whole substance of the bread is converted into the body," and, "the whole substance of the wine becomes into the blood." — Can. 2.

"The whole Christ is contained under each species, and under every part of each species, when separated." — Can. 3.

"The principal fruit of the most holy Eucharist is the remission of sins." — Can. 5.

"In the Eucharist, Christ is to be adored." — Can. 6.

"All and each of Christ's faithful are bound to communicate every year." — Can. 9.

"Sacrificial confession is to be made beforehand, by those whose conscience is burdened with mortal sin." — Can. 11.

The same view is taught, though less distinctly, in the Greek Church in the Orthodox Confession of the Eastern Church, Ques. CVI., CVII. (ii. 380-385); in the Confession of Dositheus (ii. 427-432); in the Longer Catechism of the Eastern Church, qu. 115:—

"What is the Communion? A sacrament, in which the believer, under the forms of bread and wine, partakes of the very Body and Blood of Christ, to everlasting life." (ii. 426).

The authoritative teaching of the Lutheran Church is thus given, Augsburg Confession (A.D. 1530), Art. X.:—

"The true body and blood of Christ are truly present under the form of bread and wine, and are there communicatet to and received by those that eat in the Lord's Supper." (iii. 13).

Afterwards Melanchthon changed this article in the edition of 1540, substituting for distributantur ("communicated") exibantur ("shown"). This departure occasioned much controversy. The Lutheran doctrine is thus given in the Formula of Concord (A.D. 1578), Art. VII., Affirmation:—

"We believe, teach, and confess that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, and that they are truly distributed and taken together with the bread and wine." (iii. 337).

The authoritative teaching of the Reformed

1 The references in parentheses are to Schaff's Creeds.
The Lord's Supper is thus given: First Helvetic Confession (A.D. 1536), XXIII.:—

"The bread and wine (of the Supper) are holy, true symbols, through which the Lord offers and presents the true cornucopia, and blood of Christ for the feeding and nourishing of the spiritual and eternal life" (iii. 228).

So also in the Second Helvetic Confession, Cap. XIX., Art. 1391-1393.

The French Confession of Faith (A.D. 1559), XXXVI., XXXVIII.:—

"The Lord's Supper is a witness of the union which we have with Christ, inasmuch as he not only died and rose again for us once, but also feeds and nourishes us truly with his flesh and blood, so that we may be one in him, and that our life may be in common."

"The bread and wine in the sacrament serve to our spiritual nourishment, in as much as they show, as to our sight, that the body of Christ is our meat, and his blood our drink" (iii. 389, 381).

The Scotch Confession of Faith (A.D. 1560), Art. XXI.:—

"The faithful in the right use of the Lord's Table do so eat the body and drink the blood of the Lord Jesus that he remains in them and they in him" (iii. 467-474).

The Belgic Confession (A.D. 1561), Art. XXXV.:—

"Christ that he might represent unto us this spiritual and heavenly bread hath instituted an earthly and visible bread as a Sacrament of his body, and wine as a Sacrament of his blood, to testify by them unto us, that, as certainly as we receive and hold this Sacrament in our hands, and eat and drink the same with our mouths, by which our life is afterwards nourished, we also do as certainly receive by faith (which is the hand and mouth of our soul) the true body and blood of Christ our only Saviour in our souls, for the support of our spiritual life" (iii. 428-431).

The Heidelberg Catechism (A.D. 1563), qu. 76:—

"What is it to eat of the crucified body and drink the shed blood of Christ? It is not only to embrace with a believing heart all the sufferings and death of Christ, and thereby to obtain the forgiveness of sins and life eternal, but moreover, also, to be so united more and more to his sacred body by the Holy Ghost, who dwells both in Christ and in us, that although he is in heaven, and we are upon the earth, nevertheless of his flesh, and bones of his bones, and live and are governed forever by one Spirit, as members of the same body are by the one soul" (iii. 322, 323).

The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England (A.D. 1562), Art. XXVIII.:—

"The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a [heavenly and spiritual] partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ" (iii. 500).

So the Irish Articles of Religion (A.D. 1615, iii. 542, 543).

The Westminster Confession of Faith (A.D. 1647), Chap. XXIX.:—

"The Lord's Supper is to be observed for the perpetual remembrance of the sacrifice of himself in his death, the sealing of all benefits thereof with true believers, their spiritual nourishment and growth in him, their further engagement in, and to all duties which they owe unto him; and to be a bond and pledge of their communion with him, and with each other, as members of his mystical body."

"Worthy believers do inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all the benefits of his death" (iii. 683-687).

The Westminster Shorter Catechism (A.D. 1647), qu. 96:—

"What is the Lord's Supper? A sacrament wherein by the giving and receiving bread and wine, according to Christ's appointment, his death is shown forth, and the worthy receivers are, not after a corporal and carnal manner, but by faith, made partakers of his body and blood with all its benefits, to their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace" (iii. 687).

The Confession of the Society of Friends (A.D. 1679), Thirteenth Proposition:—

"The communion of the body and blood of Christ is inward and spiritual, which is the participation of his flesh and blood, by which the inward man is daily nourished in the hearts of those in whom Christ dwells; of which the breaking of bread by Christ with his disciples was a figure, which they even used in the Church for a time, who had received the substance, for the cause of the Sacrament; even 'abstaining from things strangled, and from blood,' the washing one another's feet, and the anointing of the sick with oil; all which are connected with the less authority and solemnity than the former; yet seeing they are but the shadow of better things, they please in such as have obtained the substance" (iii. 797).

Reformed Episcopal Articles of Religion (A.D. 1875), Art. XXVII.:—

"The Supper of the Lord is a memorial of our Redemption by Christ's death, for whereby we do show forth the Lord's death till he come. It is also a sign of the soul's feeding upon Christ. And it is a sign of the communion that we should have with one another" (iii. 829).

V. Forms of Celebration. [The original institution of the Lord's Supper took place upon the night preceding the crucifixion; that is, it was upon Thursday, the 14th of Nisan, corresponding to our April 6, A.D. 30. The place of meeting was the large upper room of a Jerusalem house. The company consisted of our Lord and eleven of his disciples; for, although Judas Iscariot was present at the Paschal Supper, it is unlikely that he staid to the after-celebration. (Compare John xiii. 30.) The so-called "Lord's Supper" directly followed the ordinary paschal meal. The articles used were the bread and wine upon the table at the time. The position of the first communicants was reclining, according to custom (John xiii. 28, 25, and art. MEALS). From the New Testament it appears, that in the first Christian congregations, more especially in that of Jerusalem, the Lord's Supper was celebrated with exactly the same plainness and simplicity which characterized its institution. Between worship and any other act of daily life, no distinction had as yet developed; no ceremonies, no ritual, existed. The members of the congregation lived with each other like members of one large family, but a family of a new and higher type. Every day they gathered in the houses for the sake of common devotion. They ate together; and, when the meal was finished, one of them would arise, take the bread and break it, and pass the pieces around, together with the cup, in exactly the way in which the Lord had ordered it to be done. There was a danger, however, in administering the communion in this way. It might happen that the sacrament would gradu-
It is difficult to determine in detail the relation between the Lord’s Supper and the agape; it was, no doubt, different in the different countries. Thus while, according to the descriptions of divine service given by Justin (in his Apology, I, 65) and by Pliny (in his famous letter to Trajan, X, 90), the agape and the communion were treated in Asia Minor, in the beginning of the second century, as two distinct acts, other Christian writers, and especially a number of canonical decrees, show that in the West, and also in Africa, they were at the same time celebrated in connection with each other; and from Socrates (Hist. Eccl., v. 22) and Sozomen (Hist. Eccl., vii. 19) it is evident, that, in Egypt, the connection was continued even down to the fourth century. The steadily increasing danger, however, of the desecration of the sacrament, made a separation necessary. First it was ordered that the celebration of the Eucharist should take place, not at the end, but at the beginning, of the meal. Only on one day, the anniversary of the institution, the celebration was allowed by the Council of Carthage (362) to take place at the end of the meal, in order to make the imitation of the last meeting between Christ and the apostles as close as possible. Next it was decided that the agape should be celebrated in the evening, while the communion should be administered in the morning, before sunrise; and finally the councils of Laodicea (363), Carthage (392), and Orleans (533), forbade altogether to celebrate the agape in the churches; while the church, of course, continued to be the usual place for the celebration of the Lord’s Supper. Thus the separation was completed. The first description of a communion administered independently of the agape is that above mentioned by Justin. "After a prayer," he says, "we greet each other with a kiss. Then the leader of the meeting brings forwards bread and wine, and makes a prayer, to which the whole congregation answers, Amen. Finally the deacon distributes the bread and wine over which the prayer has been said, to all present, and something is also carried to the houses of those who are absent."

It must be noticed, that, in this description, the celebration of the Eucharist is in no wise represented as a mystery, but as a simple public act; and exactly the same character it has in the descriptions of Ignatius, Tertullian, Januarius, etc. The Apostolical Constitutions were, indeed, the first to represent the administration of the communion as an act from which not only all profane persons, infidels, Jews, and Pagans, but also the catechumens, the penitent, and the excommunicated should be excluded,—an act performed by the faithful alone, within closed doors, with certain ceremonies, and after certain preparations. The rules of the Liturgia Sancti Jacobi in Methoni, the oldest church constitution existing, gives a picture of the act such as it was performed during the third and fourth centuries. After the common service was finished, the deacon began the “mass of the faithful,” with the words, “Let no one go away who is allowed to stay!”
twelfth or thirteenth century, though it was an old custom to receive the blessing with which the community clothed itself in a glowing position. With reference to the elements, the Eastern Church was accustomed to use leavened bread; while in the ninth century unleavened bread came into use in the Western Church, from a regard to the circumstance that the institution of the sacrament had taken place on the "day of unleavened bread." The question, however, was left standing, as an adiaphoron. The bread was round, thin cakes stamped with some figure,—the cross, or A and Ο, etc.; or some word,—Jesus, Deus, etc. The Syrian Jacobites added salt and oil to the bread; the Artotyrites (a Montanist sect of the second century), even cheese. The wine was in antiquity always mixed with water, and no distinction was made between red and white wine. By heretical sects, various substitutes were used for wine; such as water, milk, honey, unfermented grape-juice, etc. The breaking of the bread, referring to the breaking of the body of Christ, was the general custom in antiquity, and has been retained by all churches except the Lutheran. With this feature of the administration was connected another, of blending the bread and the wine together, referring to the close union between the body and the blood; and the Greek lay so strong an emphasis on this blending, that they drop the pieces of the broken bread into the wine, and present them to the communicants by means of a spoon. The formula of distribution was, up to the time of Gregory the Great, the above-mentioned: οίμα προσκυνούμενο ("body of Christ"); οίμα χρωστόν ("blood of Christ"); η προσκύνησις του κυρίου ("cup of life"). But after that time more elaborate formulas occur; such as, Corpus (sanguis) Domini nostrri Jesu Christi conservet animam tuam ("May the body [blood] of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul"); or, Corpus ... custodiat te in vitam aeternam ("body ... preserve thee unto eternal life"); or, Corpus et sanguis Agni Dei, quod tibi datur in remissionem peccatorum ("body and blood of the Lamb of God, which was given for thee to the remission of sins"); or, Corpus ... sit tibi salus animae et corporis ("May the body ... be to thee salvation in body and soul"); or, in the Orient, Corpus sanctum, prexionem, verum, Immanuelis filii Dei hoc est verum ("This is truly the holy, precious, true body of Immanuel, the Son of God"); Sanguis prexionis, verum, Immanuelis filii Dei hoc est verum ("This is truly the precious, true blood of Immanuel, the Son of God").

The form which the Greek Church developed for the celebration of the Lord's Supper is entirely different from that developed by the Roman-Catholic Church. It is symbolical throughout. Not only does one of the antiphonal choirs which perform during the act represent in some mystical way the cherubim, but the whole act is, in its every feature, a symbolical representation of the passion. Five loaves are laid on the altar, each stamped with the sign of the cross and the inscription, Ἱερονύς χρωστός μετά. The officiating priest selects one of them for the sacrificial lamb; and with a symbolical reference to the soldier who pierced the side of Jesus with a spear, so that blood and water flowed from the wound, he cuts the bread in the form of a lance—into it, while at the same time the deacon pours the wine and the water into the cup. Under sørnē dirigės the elements are then carried in a solemn procession, headed with many lighted candles and much incense-burning, through the church, and back again to the altar, where they are deposited, like the body of Christ in the tomb. A curtain is lowered before the altar; and, unseen by the congregation, the elements are consecrated by the bishop while the choir is chanting the Lord's Prayer. When the curtain is drawn, the altar represents the tomb from which Christ has risen; and, while the choir sings a hymn of praise, the elements are presented to the communicants without any special formula of distribution.

All the various forms under which the Lord's Supper is celebrated in the various Protestant churches may be referred to two types,—the one established by Luther, and the other by Calvin. Luther issued two liturgies,—one of 1523, in which the whole Latin mass, even the language, is retained, so far as it does not openly contradict Scripture; and one of 1526, the so-called Deutsche Messe. It is the latter, which, with various modifications, has been adopted by all Lutheran churches. Its principal characteristics are, the consecration of the elements by the sign of the cross; the use of the wafer, that is, of unleavened bread which is not broken; the use of white instead of red wine; and the kneeling position of the communicants, who receive the elements in the mouth, and not in the hand. The Calvinist type has generally retained the character of a common meal; the whole arrangement is freer and more simple; the solemn ceremonies are reduced to the least possible; while the holy earnest of the act itself is emphasized as strongly as possible. In the French Reformed Church the elements are placed—the bread in two silver dishes, and the wine in two silver cups—on a table spread with a white linen cloth. From twenty-five to thirty communicants approach the table at a time. The officiating minister makes a free prayer, and then, while repeating the words of institution, presents the elements to his neighbors on the left and on the right, after which the dish and the cup pass from hand to hand. With various modifications this type has been adopted by all the Reformed churches. In no church, however, is the imitation of the ancient form of the communion so close as in the Church of England. In the United Church of Prussia the form adopted is a combination of the Lutheran and the Calvinistic type. The Quakers do not celebrate the Lord's Supper at all.
of the bread and the wine. As in the Church of England, so in her daughter the Episcopal Church in America, in the Methodist-Episcopal Church, and also in many Lutheran churches, the communicants kneel at the chancel-railing in little companies; and to each one, in turn, a certain formula is spoken, as first the bread, and then the wine, is dispensed. In the German Reformed Church they stand. The Friends spiritualize both baptism and the Lord’s Supper, and the latter has no such outward ordinances. Various terms are used to designate the Lord’s Supper, such as Eucharist, Communion, Holy Communion, Blessed Sacrament, etc.


LORD’S SUPPER. Controversies respecting.

LORETO, or LORETTO (Lauretum), a town to the south-east of Ancona, the chief seat of the Italian Mary-worship, and not inappropriately called the “Mecca of medieval Christendom.” The legend referred to below seems to have originated towards the close of the period of the crusades, and in close connection with the final destruction of the kingdom of Jerusalem by the Turks. It first occurs in Italia illustrata, by Flavius Blondus, papal secretary (d. in 1464); but in its fully developed form it is not found until about a century later on, in Baptista Mantuanus: Redemptoris mundi Mysterium, the historia in his Op. omnia, Antwerp, 1576, iv. 216. Properly speaking, the casa santa is not the whole house of Mary, but only that room in the house in Nazareth in which she was born herself, and in which Jesus was educated. By the apostles the room was transformed into a church, and St. Luke adorned it with a wooden statue representing the Virgin with the child. As long as the kingdom of Jerusalem existed, service was regularly celebrrated in the church every Sunday; but, after its overthrow by the Turks, the angels carried away the church through the air, and deposited it (1291) at Teramo, in North Italy. The years later on (1294) it was again moved by the angels across the Adriatic, and placed where it now stands, in a wood belonging to a noble and pious lady, Laureta. It did not become the noted place of pilgrimage, however, until the second half of the fourteenth century. Pious pilgrims in large numbers made their way thither. In 1539 the popes confirmed the truth of the legend by a bull of 1471; Clement VII. built the church over the casa santa; and Innocent XIII. instituted a special officium cum missa, in honor of the holy Virgin of Loreto. Innumerable and often immensely costly presents were offered by pious pilgrims. When Louis XIV. was born, his father, Louis XIII., presented the church with an angel of silver weighing three hundred and fifty-one pounds, and holding a child of gold weighing twenty-four pounds. On the occasion of the birth of the Pretender, James II. presented a still more costly statue,—a kneeling angel of gold. In 1798, however, the French plundered the church, and carried away the spoils; and Napoleon returned only a part of them in 1800. The first opposition to the legend and its practical consequences came from Vergerius, whose Della Camera e Statua della Madonna (Bologna, 1584) was translated into Latin under the characteristic title, De idolo Laurentio (Rome, 1596). An exhaustive criticism is found in Cabanbonus: Exercit. VII. ad Baronii Annales, 1615; [P. R. Kendrick: The Holy House of Loreto, Phila.]. Zöckler.

LORIMER, Peter, D.D., an English Presbyterian divine was b. in Edinburgh, June 27, 1812, and d. at Whitehaven, July 28, 1879. He was the son of a master-builder who occupied a good position in that business in his native city. He received the elements of his education at George Heriot’s Hospital, an institution originally founded, in the reign of James VI., for the maintenance and “upbringing” of the sons of decayed burgesses, but in more recent times, with largely increased revenues, placed, in many ways, on a much wider basis than was contemplated by its founder. With a bursary of thirty pounds per annum, he proceeded from the hospital to Edinburgh University. Here he passed through the classes of the art’s curriculum with much credit, and also took his theological course as a student of divinity; the professor of divinity at the time being the celebrated Dr. Thomas Chalmers, to whom, as a teacher, Dr. Lorimer always acknowledged the highest obligations. In the year 1836 he was ordained as minister of the Presbyterian Church, Prince’s Terrace, London, in connection with the Established Church of Scotland. In 1843, he, along with his congregation, broke up his connection with the Scottish Church, casting in his lot with the “Free Church of Scotland,” and to which he ever afterwards continued to be warmly attached. In the year 1846, a theological college having been established in London by the English Presbyterian Church, Dr. Lorimer was appointed one of its professors, and in 1878 he was made principal of the college. In 1857 he had the
LOT.

LOT, The Use of the, among the Hebrews. The name for "lot" is יְפָשַׁת, which literally means "little stone," in reference to the different colored stones one used to throw to obtain the divine decision of the question. Faith in a special providence underlay the practice. The decision of the lot was ordered of God. The following classes of cases in which it was resorted to are recorded in the Bible: 1. Partitions.—(a) That of the land of Israel (Num. xxvi. 55; Josh. xviii. 17). Accordin to Jewish tradition, the process was carried on by means of two urns, in one of which were the names of the different families of the Israelites, in the other the lots, upon which the portions of territory were described. Presiding over the drawing was the high priest, with urim and thummim. (b) That of the cities for the Levites (Josh. xxi. 4 sqq.). (c) That of the families returned from the exile, so that one in ten might dwell in Jerusalem (Neh. xi. 1). (d) That of the spoil, also of the prisoners, and of the clothing of condemned persons among the executors (Joel iii. 3; Obad. 11; Nah. iii. 10; Matt. xxvii. 5; John xix. 23). 2. Selection of Persons.—(a) The choice of men for an invading force (Judg. xx. 8). (b) The choice of a person to fill an office. — Saul (1 Sam. ix. 9), was chosen by drawing lots (Acts i. 26); but these were quite exceptional cases. (c) The choice of priests to fill the twenty-four courses, and perform various duties (1 Chron. xxiv. 5; Luke i. 9; Neh. x. 34 sqq.). (d) The choice of the scapegoat on the Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi. 8) carried away captive, but rescued and restored by Abraham. The moral status of the Sodomites is amply illustrated by the story of the visit of the angels thither, and our word "Sodomy." Lot was personally pure (Gen. xvi. 3-5). At length the wrath of God against the cities of the plain could no longer be repressed. Abraham, on being warned of the approaching disaster, pleaded with God for them; but they did not contain the requisite ten righteous persons (Gen. xviii. 23). Two angels warned Lot also, who obeyed, but was unable to induce his sons-in-law to flee. The Lord rained brimstone and fire upon Sodom and Gomorrah and all the cities of the plain. Lot's wife, on looking back, contrary to the express command of the angels, became "a pillar of salt." (No faith is to be put in the identifications.) From Sodom, Lot fled to Zoar, and thence to a cave in "the mountain." Anxiety to preserve seed of their father was the excuse for the inexact which his two daughters committed with Lot while overcome by wine. In this way the ancestors of the Moabites and Ammonites respectively were born.

In the narrative we have not legend, but family traditional history. The picture presented is true to life and to the times. The destruction of the cities of the plain was due to natural causes, and made so profound an impression, that not only do the Bible writers often allude to it (Deut. xxiii. 23; Isa. i. 9; Jer. xx. 16; Lam. iv. 6; Hos. xi. 8; Amos iv. 11), but also Strabo and Tacitus (Hist., v. 7). The Dead Sea is called by the Arabs to-day Bahr Lut ("the Sea of Lot"). For further particulars of the event and the region, see PAL ESTINE, SALT SEA, SODOM. von Orelli.

LOT, The son of Haran, and nephew of Abraham; accompanied his uncle from Ur to Canaan and Egypt, and back to Canaan. There the size of their respective flocks and herds gave rise to constant strife among their herdsmen; and so Abraham and Lot, on the suggestion of the former, peacefully parted. Lot went forth in the Jordan valley, attracted by the apparent richness of the country. He lived in Sodom, and brought up his family, and allowed his daughters to marry among the inhabitants. On one occasion the city was attacked by Chedorlaomer; and Lot was carried away captive, but rescued and restored by Abraham. The moral status of the Sodomites was amply illustrated by the story of the visit of the angels thither, and our word "Sodomy." Lot was personally pure (Gen. xvi. 3-5). At length the wrath of God against the cities of the plain could no longer be repressed. Abraham, on being warned of the approaching disaster, pleaded with God for them; but they did not contain the requisite ten righteous persons (Gen. xviii. 23). Two angels warned Lot also, who obeyed, but was unable to induce his sons-in-law to flee. The Lord rained brimstone and fire upon Sodom and Gomorrah and all the cities of the plain. Lot's wife, on looking back, contrary to the express command of the angels, became "a pillar of salt." (No faith is to be put in the identifications.) From Sodom, Lot fled to Zoar, and thence to a cave in "the mountain." Anxiety to preserve seed of their father was the excuse for the inexact which his two daughters committed with Lot while overcome by wine. In this way the ancestors of the Moabites and Ammonites respectively were born. In the narrative we have not legend, but family traditional history. The picture presented is true to life and to the times. The destruction of the cities of the plain was due to natural causes, and made so profound an impression, that not only do the Bible writers often allude to it (Deut. xxiii. 23; Isa. i. 9; Jer. xx. 16; Lam. iv. 6; Hos. xi. 8; Amos iv. 11), but also Strabo and Tacitus (Hist., v. 7). The Dead Sea is called by the Arabs to-day Bahr Lut ("the Sea of Lot"). For further particulars of the event and the region, see PAL ESTINE, SALT SEA, SODOM. von Orelli.

LOT, The son of Haran, and nephew of Abraham; accompanied his uncle from Ur to Canaan and Egypt, and back to Canaan. There the size of their respective flocks and herds gave rise to constant strife among their herdsmen; and so Abraham and Lot, on the suggestion of the former, peacefully parted. Lot went forth in the Jordan valley, attracted by the apparent richness of the country. He lived in Sodom, and brought up his family, and allowed his daughters to marry among the inhabitants. On one occasion the city was attacked by Chedorlaomer; and Lot was carried away captive, but rescued and restored by Abraham. The moral status of the Sodomites was amply illustrated by the story of the visit of the angels thither, and our word "Sodomy." Lot was personally pure (Gen. xvi. 3-5). At length the wrath of God against the cities of the plain could no longer be repressed. Abraham, on being warned of the approaching disaster, pleaded with God for them; but they did not contain the requisite ten righteous persons (Gen. xviii. 23). Two angels warned Lot also, who obeyed, but was unable to induce his sons-in-law to flee. The Lord rained brimstone and fire upon Sodom and Gomorrah and all the cities of the plain. Lot's wife, on looking back, contrary to the express command of the angels, became "a pillar of salt." (No faith is to be put in the identifications.) From Sodom, Lot fled to Zoar, and thence to a cave in "the mountain." Anxiety to preserve seed of their father was the excuse for the inexact which his two daughters committed with Lot while overcome by wine. In this way the ancestors of the Moabites and Ammonites respectively were born.

In the narrative we have not legend, but family traditional history. The picture presented is true to life and to the times. The destruction of the cities of the plain was due to natural causes, and made so profound an impression, that not only do the Bible writers often allude to it (Deut. xxiii. 23; Isa. i. 9; Jer. xx. 16; Lam. iv. 6; Hos. xi. 8; Amos iv. 11), but also Strabo and Tacitus (Hist., v. 7). The Dead Sea is called by the Arabs to-day Bahr Lut ("the Sea of Lot"). For further particulars of the event and the region, see PAL ESTINE, SALT SEA, SODOM. von Orelli.
either thrown from an urn, or from the bosom of the outer world.

The Bible also records the use of the lot among non-Jewish persons; e.g., Haman, to decide the best day for the destruction of the Jews (Esth. iii. 7), and the sailors of Jonah's vessel, to determine who was responsible for the storm (Jon. i. 7).

Lotze.- Lotze, Hermann von (Aug. 2, 1817—Aug. 25, 1870), a prominent leader of the battle against modern materialism; was born at Bautzen, May 21, 1817; devoted himself at Leipzig University to medical science, natural philosophy, and metaphysics; was there, in 1843, appointed professor of mental philosophy; followed in 1844, in the same capacity, a call to Göttingen, and in the spring of 1881 to Berlin, where he died July 1 of the same year.

When Lotze began his public career, the enthusiasm in favor of Hegelian ideological Pantheism, which held sway over the educated minds in Germany for a long series of years, had passed its acme, and Materialism (Charles Vogt, Moltke, Büchner) began to have controlling influence with scientists. There were some eminent representatives of theistic views (e.g., Charles Philip Fichter, J. H. Fichte, jun., H. Weisse, Ulrici), whose critical attacks on Hegel were not without some influence, especially since Neo-Schellingianism on the one hand, and Herbart's sober realism on the other, gave them support. Of these theists Weisse met, more than others, with the sympathies of Lotze, who emphatically declared himself against Hegel's Pantheism, and no less against Materialism, then becoming rampant in Germany. No one was better equipped than Lotze to demonstrate the lack of sober, solid reasoning in the positions of Materialism; since no one German scientist mastered better than he did the whole domain of natural science, and no one surpassed his critical acumen and the imperturbable equilibrium of his judgment. No philosopher had a clearer conception, and spoke with more modesty, of the limits of our mental faculties and knowledge. Acknowledging the impossibility of a demonstrative proof of the existence of God, he humbly professes his belief in God as the living center of the universe, and acknowledges that his judgments are essentially empirical, and that the absolutely good and rational are, according to Lotze, perfectly irrational. This he holds fast, though he confesses that we do not know what God's own nature is; how those two forms of existence, the material and the psychical (mental, spiritual, feeling and conscious personality), proceed from one and the same source; wherein the real difference exists between the two is not only remote, but why there is in this world moral evil and suffering, which, as it seems, is the indispensable concomitant of life. To be enabled to solve these problems we ought to be in the very centre of the cosmos, so as fully to understand its universal plan; this is, however, not our position. We can, consequently, not pretend to establish a philosophical system which would totally, and in an all-comprehensive manner, square with the whole plan and all the facts and phenomena of the universe. It is apparent that this modest and honest agent of Lotze has nothing in common with the atheistic and materialistic views of this name now prevailing in some parts of the civilized world. Lotze's whole conception of the universe is essentially ethical. The ethical principle is to him the starting-point, also, for all metaphysics; and he fully acknowledges it as the excellence of Christian faith.—The catalogue of his most prominent (as yet untranslated) publications shows the wide range of his investigations. Metaphysics, 1841 (again, as the second part of the System of Philosophy, 1879); General Pathology and Therapy as Mechanical Natural Sciences, 1842; Logic, 1843 (again, as the first part of the System of Philosophy, 1874): Essay on the Idea of the Beautiful in Art, 1846; On the Conditions of Artistic Beauty, 1846; General Physiology of Corporeal Life, 1851, Medical Psychology, 1852; Microcosmos, Thoughts bearing upon Nat. Phil. and the Hist. of the Human Race, 3 vols., 1869-84; Hist. of Abstracts in Germany, 1868. See E. Pfleiderer: Lotze's philosophy. Weltanschauung nach ihren Grundzügen. E. Ritter, Berlin, 1882, 81 pp. Lotze's Grundzüge der Religion-philosophie wurde posthumously published (1885).

LOUIS, ST., Louis IX, King of France (Nov. 15, 1226—Aug. 25, 1270), was only eleven years old when his father died. During his minority, his mother, Blanche of Castile, governed the realm. When he was twenty years old, he assumed the government himself; and as he opened his reign with a crusade,—the unfortunate campaign in Egypt, where he was taken prisoner,—so he also closed it with a crusade,—the still more unfortunate campaign in Tunis, where he died of the plague. He was a man of genuine piety; though his piety was of a strongly pronounced mediæval type, ascetic and intolerant. His daily devotions were frequent, long, and strictly observed: on the days of the great Christian festivals he wore hair-cloth, and went bare-footed; Wednesday and Friday he refrained from laughing; when he adored the cross, he prostrated himself on the ground before it, etc., but he never looked on it as a life-function which was to be tortured. In the Établissements de St. Louis he acknowledged that heretics ought to be punished with death. By an ordinance he cancelled one-third of the debt which his Christian subjects owed to the Jews, etc. He was also cRDulous and superstitious. At one time he bought the crown of thorns for a million and a half francs; at another, he bought the true cross, and placed it, with many singular ceremonies, in the Church of Notre Dame, in Paris. Nevertheless, he was not the slave of the Pope or of the clergy. The authenticity of the famous Pragmatic Sanction of 1269 is questioned; but, whether or not he ever formulated those articles, he certainly carried them out in practice. The liberties and privileges of the Gallican Church he vindicated against the encroachments of the Pope with great vigor and unswerving decision; and he forbade the Roman curia to levy money in France, under penalty, without establishing a system of taxation, which he himself undertook.—In the same spirit he defended the laity against the clergy. He wholly exempted laymen from ecclesiastical jurisdiction in civil affairs; and such ecclesiastical judges as...
attempted, by means of excommunication, to compel laymen to bring also their civil suits before the ecclesiastical court, he compelled to cancel the excommunication by confiscating their revenues. A petition from the French bishop, to give their excommunications more effect by confiscating the property of the excommunicated, he absolutely refused to listen to. In general, it may be said, that, however narrow and unsound his piety was in many of its more personal utterances, its influence on his policy was, in all its great traits, most beneficent; and he is one of the very few truly Christian characters who have ever sat on a throne. He was canonized by Boniface VIII. in 1297. See Le Nain de Tillemont: Histoire de St. Louis, which also gives a list of the very rich contemporary sources to his life; and Guizot: Histoire des quatre grands Chrétiens Français, Paris, 1873, 2 vols.; Verdier: La monarchie chrétienne de St. Louis entre la papauté et le césarisme, Lyons, 1876; H. Vallon: St. Louis, Tours, 1878; V. Verlaque: St. Louis, Paris, 1885.

LOVE, one of the most weighty, comprehensive, and universal of conceptions, having basal value in philosophy, ethics, and theology, and extending through all lands and times. It is that relation between persons, in which the personality of the one is lost in the other, in which each esteems the other better than himself (Phil. ii. 3), and all selfishness vanishes. Love is, therefore, much more than inclination or liking: it is, however, rarely found in completion. In this article we consider,—

1. Love as the Essence of God.—John says, “God is love” (1 John iv. 16), a sentence which is not a definition of the essence of God, but a statement of his feelings toward us. At the same time, the words open a profitable field of speculation in regard to the part love holds in the divine constitution. Augustine first, Richard of St. Victor next, and, after him, others, have endeavored to reconstruct the Trinity by the principle of love: thus, the Father loves the Son, and the Son loves the Father (redemptio); both loves are united in love for an object of common affection (communio); but the attempt has been unsuccessful; for the Holy Spirit is more than a product, it is a factor of the divine love; and besides, in the proposed scheme, the persons of the Godhead are not sufficiently distinguished. But it is undoubtedly true that love is a large element of the divine essence; and the later theologians, as, for instance, Dorner, in discussing the problem of the Trinity, give it much space.

2. Love as Principle in Creation.—God created the world in order that he might have a field for the exercise of his love; not that the world was necessary for him, but that he might make the world, and fill it with creatures whom he could love.

3. Love as Principle in Redemption.—God so loved the world, that he sent his Son to die for it (John iii. 16). The Son, out of his free, divine love, loved the Father, and his love for our salvation (Matt. xx. 28). God willed in Christ to reconcile the world unto himself (2 Cor. v. 19); and this love of God in Christ is the only and exclusive ground of our salvation and of our sanctification (Acts iv. 12).

4. Love as Principle in Virtue.—Love is the source and centre of the development of the new life in Christ. Our Lord set his approval upon the Mosaic summary of the law in the form of love to God and man (Matt. xxii. 37 sq.; comp. Deut. vi. 5; Lev. xix. 18), and gave his followers the “new commandment,” that they should love one another (John xiii. 34). Paul calls love the fulfilling of the law (Rom. xiii. 10), and “the end of the commandment” (1 Tim. i. 5); Peter exhorts to love as the fruit of the holy living (1 Pet. i. 22; 2 Pet. i. 8); John is particularly full upon love (1 John ii. 5, iv. 7, 8); and James calls love of our neighbors “the royal law” (i. 5, 8).

5. Phenomena of Love. Love manifests itself in the two great directions,—toward God and toward our neighbor, or in the contemplative and in the practical form; the former seen in Mary of Bethany, the latter in her sister Martha (Luke x. 38-42). Our Lord gave his preference to the former. It shows itself in prayer, meditation, worship, and in the communion. The practical, on the other hand, shows itself in all works of benevolence and beneficence, far and near. It is incumbent upon the Christian to unite the two. The hardest burden our Lord lays upon his disciples is to love their enemies (Matt. v. 44). Among human relationships controlled by love, marriage occupies the first place (Eph. v. 21 sq.). It is noticeable that the apostle who put conjugal love in the closest parallel to the “great mystery” of the love between Christ and the Church spoke slightly of conjugal life (1 Cor. vii. 1, 40).

6. Mockeries of Love. —True love can only exist between human beings: therefore, to speak of love for animals, or of love for a thing, is to use improper language. Self-love is an inaccurate but indispensable term. To love ourselves somewhat is indeed necessary; it is the measure of our love for our neighbors. What passes for love in literature, novels, and on the stage, is too commonly mere sexual longing. Even in religious talk and pictures do we find this debasement of the word as in the really sensual expressions of affection for Jesus, and in those representations in which the Saviour of the World. That so-called “love” which leads a parent or guardian to refrain from punishing a child because it would give pain, and all such like indulgences, does not deserve the name. Love for gold, and love for the world, are perversions of love, to its destruction.

Karl Burger.

LOVE, Family of. See Familists.

LOVE-Feasts. See Agape.

LOVE, Christopher, b. Cardiff, in Glamorgan-shire, 1618; educated at New Inn Hall, Oxford, 1635. After taking the master’s degree he was obliged to leave Oxford for refusing to subscribe to Archbishop Laud’s canons. He went to London, and became domestic chaplain to the sheriff, and took a bold stand against the errors of the Book of Common Prayer and the religious tyranny of the times. He was cast into prison on account of an aggressive sermon at Newcastle, and in various ways persecuted in the break of the civil war he was made preacher to the garrison of Windsor Castle, where he gave great offence to the prelatical party by his pointed utterances. He was one of the first to receive presbyteral ordination under the new organiza-
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LOWDER, Charles Fuge, vicar of St. Peter's, London Docks; b. at Bath, June 22, 1820; d. at Zell-am-See, Austria, Sept. 9, 1880. He was educated at King's College, London, and at Oxford, where he took his degree, 1848. He was ordained deacon, April 31, 1843, and became a curate at Walton-cum-Street, near Glastonbury; was ordained priest, Dec. 22, 1844; resigned his curacy, and became chaplain to the Axbridge Workhouse; then moved to Tethoven as senior curate, autumn of 1845. In 1851 he came to London as curate at St. Barnabas. There he was called upon to fight in behalf of certain ritualistic changes. In 1856 he began, not only the most important work of his life, but what was really his life-work, for which all his previous experiences were preparatory,—he headed the mission to St. George's-in-the-East. On June 30, 1866, St. Peter's Church, London Docks, was consecrated; and he became first vicar of the new parish of St. Peter's-in-the-East, constructed out of his former one, and until his death he labored faithfully at this post.

The scene of Mr. Lowder's labors was in East London, in the neighborhood of the Great Docks. The people living there were the worst imaginable. He deliberately put himself in direct contact with their far worse than heathen darkness and degradation; for he yearned over those poor, besotted souls, and did his utmost, during four and twenty years, to carry to them the pure and elevating gospel of Jesus Christ. The measures he adopted were severely criticised. The very people for whom he would have gladly died, rose in rebellion against the "popery," as they called it, of his ritualistic services. It is true he was a ritualist. He called himself a "priest of the Catholic Church." He conducted services with ritualistic additions of crosses, colored vestments, lights, etc.; he heard confessions, granted absolution, and was generally addressed and spoken of as "Father Lowder." In dress, mode of living, general style of theological thought, he resembled a Roman-Catholic priest. He had bound himself by vows of celibacy and poverty. He centred his attention upon the church; but he was not a Roman Catholic, for he yielded no allegiance to the Pope, nor adored the Virgin Mary. He strained every nerve to benefit his parishioners, to educate them, to cure them of their vices; and he succeeded. Like the river in Ezekiel's vision, everywhere his influence went, life sprang up. He lived among blackguards of every description,—thieves, drunkards, prostitutes, the very scum of London, the most debased population in the world. But he was there to do them.
good, to teach them the way to God; and the numbers whom he reclaimed, and the even greater numbers, probably, whom he restrained from sin, testify to the power of his influence. His "ritualism" becomes a matter of small consequence in view of the results of his work, for he saved a multitude of souls. When his remains were brought to London, they were received with extraordinary marks of respect. His funeral was attended by three thousand persons who mourned him as a faithful and beloved friend. "No such funeral has been seen in London in modern times." See Charles Lowder: a Biography (anonymous), London, 1882; 3d ed., same year. Samuel M. Jackson.

Lowell, John, founder of the Lowell Institute; b. in Boston, May 11, 1799; d. in Bombay, India, March 4, 1838. He studied for two years at Harvard College; but ill health prevented his graduation, and the greater part of his mature life was spent in travel. He left two hundred and fifty thousand dollars for the maintenance in Boston of annual courses of free public lectures upon religion, science, literature, and the arts. The Lowell Institute, as it is called, went into operation in the winter of 1839–40.

Lowman, Moses, a dissenting divine; b. in London, 1860; d. there (in Clapham, Surrey) May 3, 1759. He published several estimable works, —An Argument from Prophecy in Proof that Jesus is the Messiah, 1733; A Paraphrase and Notes on the Revelation of St. John, 1737, 2d ed., 1745, new edition, 1807 (this work is now incorporated with Patrick, Lowth, and Whiby's Commentary); A Dissertation on the Civil Government of the Hebrews, 1740; A Rational of the Ritual of the Hebrew Worship, 1748 (new edition, 1818).

Low-sunday, the first Sunday after Easter, so called because formerly some portion of the great festival of Easter was repeated upon it; hence it was a feast of a lower degree than Easter.

Lowth, Robert, D.D., F.R.S., b. at Winchester, Nov. 27, 1710; d. at Fulham, Nov. 3, 1787. He was graduated at Oxford, 1734; took orders; was successively fellow of New College, professor of poetry (1741), archdeacon of Winchester (1752), bishop of Durham, and rector of Sedgefield (1755), bishop of St. David's (1756), of Oxford (1768), and of London (1777). In 1783, on the death of Dr. Cornwallis, George III. offered him the archbishopric of Canterbury; but he declined it on account of his years and family afflictions, he having just lost his second daughter. Bishop Lowth attained permanent fame by two works. (1) De sacra poesi Hebraeorum praelucname acade micis Ovania habita, Oxford, 1768, 2d ed., 1768, 3d ed., 1775, 4th ed., 1787; edited with notes by J. D. Michaelis, Göttingen, 1756–62, 2d ed., 1769–70, 2 vols.; reprinted edition with additional notes by E. F. K. Rosenmüller, and excursus by K. F. Richter and Ch. Weiss, Leipzig, 1815 (the notes of Michaelis were printed as a supplementary volume by the second and subsequent editions of the original; Rosenmüller's edition was reprinted, Oxford, 1788); reprinted edition with additional notes by E. F. K. Rosenmüller, and excursus by K. F. Richter and Ch. Weiss, Leipzig, 1815 (the notes of Michaelis were printed as a supplementary volume by the second and subsequent editions of the original; Rosenmüller's edition was reprinted, Oxford, 1788); reprinted edition with additional notes by E. F. K. Rosenmüller, and excursus by K. F. Richter and Ch. Weiss, Leipzig, 1815; 2 vols., 3d ed., 1835, 1 vol., 5th ed., 1847; American edition by Calvin E. Stowe, Andover, 1829; French translations, Léons de la poésie sacrée des Hébreux, Lyons, 1812, 2 vols.; Cours de poésie sacrée (abridged), Paris, 1812, 2 vols. These bibliographical details suffice to show the popularity of the work. It is, indeed, the most complete work upon the subject. The most damaging criticism brought against it is that Lowth attempts the impossible,—to bring Hebrew poetry under the categories of the classical variety. (See art. Hebrew Poetry). (2) Isaiah: A New [metrical] Translation, with a Preliminary Dissertation, Notes, Critical, Philological, and Explanatory, London, 1778, 13th ed., 1842; American edition from tenth English edition, Boston, 1834; German translation by Professor J. B. Koppe, Leipzig, 1779. Lowth's translation is generally much admired, but in the judgment of some critics it alters the Hebrew text unduly. Besides these two great works, he wrote a Life of William of Wykeham (London, 1768, 2d ed., 1769), and several pamphlets. His Sermons and other works were few in number, but weighty in value: A Collection of the Divine Authority and Inspiration of the Old and New Testament, in Answer to (Le Clerc's) Five Letters, Oxford, 1892, 3d ed., 1821 (this brought him into notice); Directions for the Profitable Reading of the Holy Scriptures, London, 1768, 7th ed., 1799; but his principal work was a Commentary on the Prophets, London, 1714–23, 4 vols., afterwards collected in one folio volume, and incorporated with Bishop Patrick's Commentary, and frequently reprinted, in that connection, under the caption, Patrick, Lowth, and Whiby's Commentary. Dr. Lowth was the efficient assistant upon several works which pass under other names, such as Dr. Potter's edition of Clemens Alexandrinus, Oxford, 1715, 2 vols., enlarged edition, Venice, 1757, 2 vols.; Hudson's Josephus, Oxford, 1720, 2 vols.; Reading's Historie Ecclesiastica, Cambridge, 1720, 3 vols. (reprinted Turin, 1749). A Life of Dr. Lowth will be found in the seventh edition of his Directions, etc.

Loyola. See Ignatius Loyola.

Lucian the Martyr was born at Samosata about the middle of the third century, and educated at Edessa, whose school, next to that of Alexandria, was the most flourishing one in Christendom, and numbered such men as Macarius and Bardesanes among its teachers. He afterwards settled at Antioch, and became the founder of a celebrated school of exegetes. Eusebius of Nicomedia, Maris of Chalcedon, Theognis of Nicea, Leontius of Antioch, Antonius of Tarsus, Asterius of Aquileia, and several others, such as Dr. Potter's edition of Clemens Alexandrinus, Oxford, 1715, 2 vols., enlarged edition, Venice, 1757, 2 vols.; Hudson's Josephus, Oxford, 1720, 2 vols.; Reading's Historie Ecclesiastica, Cambridge, 1720, 3 vols. (reprinted Turin, 1749). A Life of Dr. Lowth will be found in the seventh edition of his Directions, etc.
a martyr during the persecution of Maximinus. Of his works, Eusebius mentions none; but his peculiar position as father of Arianism was, of course, sufficient reason for Eusebius to throw a veil of obscurity around him. Jerome mentions his recension of the Bible-text, his De Fide, and some letters, to which must be added the apologetical oration communicated by Rufinus. His recension of the Bible-text was used in the whole western part of the Byzantine Empire, from Antioch to Constantinople; while that of Hesychius was used in Alexandria and Egypt; and that of Origen, in Syria and Palestine. Of his recension of the New-Testament text, Jerome speaks disparagingly, and it was forbidden by the Decretum Gelasianum. Of that of the Septuagint, Jerome speaks in better terms; and a tolerably distinct idea may be formed of its character and method. Of the De Fide and the letters, some very slight traces are left; but nothing of his apologetical labors. In the apologetical oration the doctrinal system of Arianism is visible.

LUCIAN OF SAMOSATA flourished during the second half of the second century, but the exact dates of his birth and death are not known. He was born at Samosata on the Euphrates; studied first law, and began to practise at Antioch, then rhetoric, after which he made a professional tour through the empire, visiting Rome several times, Southern Gaul, Thessalonica, Olympia, etc., and returned to Syria in middle life rich and famous. Later on, probably because his money was gone, he moved to Rome, which alone interests as here is his Peregrinus Proteus, in which he represents his hero as having a secret Christian in the author, the chapter, or the setting of the whole story, or the type of the writer, or a form of his resurrection, or the use of the apocryphal text of the Bible, or the use of the apocryphal character of the story. In the apologetical oration the doctrinal system of Arianism is visible.

ADOLF HARNACK.

LUCIFER (light-giver), a term applied by Isaiah to the king of Babylon (Isa. xiv. 12), and not occurring elsewhere in the Bible. It indicates the king's glory as that of 'a sun of the morning;' a morning-star. Tertullian and others have, it would seem, without sufficient warrant, applied the term to Satan; and this is now the common acceptation.

LUCIFER and the LUCIFERIANS. When Constantius, at the synod of Aries (353), succeeded in carrying through the condemnation of Athanasius, Bishop Lucrius of Sardis studied first law, and began to practise at Antioch, then rhetoric, after which he made a professional tour through the empire, visiting Rome several times, Southern Gaul, Thessalonica, Olympia, etc., and returned to Syria in middle life rich and famous. Later on, probably because his money was gone, he moved to Rome, which alone interests as here is his Peregrinus Proteus, in which he represents his hero as having a secret Christian in the author, the chapter, or the setting of the whole story, or the type of the writer, or a form of his resurrection, or the use of the apocryphal text of the Bible, or the use of the apocryphal character of the story. In the apologetical oration the doctrinal system of Arianism is visible.

LUCIFER and the LUCIFERIANS. When Constantius, at the synod of Aries (353), succeeded in carrying through the condemnation of Athanasius, Bishop Lucrius of Sardis studied first law, and began to practise at Antioch, then rhetoric, after which he made a professional tour through the empire, visiting Rome several times, Southern Gaul, Thessalonica, Olympia, etc., and returned to Syria in middle life rich and famous. Later on, probably because his money was gone, he moved to Rome, which alone interests as here is his Peregrinus Proteus, in which he represents his hero as having a secret Christian in the author, the chapter, or the setting of the whole story, or the type of the writer, or a form of his resurrection, or the use of the apocryphal text of the Bible, or the use of the apocryphal character of the story. In the apologetical oration the doctrinal system of Arianism is visible.

LUCIFER and the LUCIFERIANS. When Constantius, at the synod of Aries (353), succeeded in carrying through the condemnation of Athanasius, Bishop Lucrius of Sardis studied first law, and began to practise at Antioch, then rhetoric, after which he made a professional tour through the empire, visiting Rome several times, Southern Gaul, Thessalonica, Olympia, etc., and returned to Syria in middle life rich and famous. Later on, probably because his money was gone, he moved to Rome, which alone interests as here is his Peregrinus Proteus, in which he represents his hero as having a secret Christian in the author, the chapter, or the setting of the whole story, or the type of the writer, or a form of his resurrection, or the use of the apocryphal text of the Bible, or the use of the apocryphal character of the story. In the apologetical oration the doctrinal system of Arianism is visible.

LUCIFER and the LUCIFERIANS. When Constantius, at the synod of Aries (353), succeeded in carrying through the condemnation of Athanasius, Bishop Lucrius of Sardis studied first law, and began to practise at Antioch, then rhetoric, after which he made a professional tour through the empire, visiting Rome several times, Southern Gaul, Thessalonica, Olympia, etc., and returned to Syria in middle life rich and famous. Later on, probably because his money was gone, he moved to Rome, which alone interests as here is his Peregrinus Proteus, in which he represents his hero as having a secret Christian in the author, the chapter, or the setting of the whole story, or the type of the writer, or a form of his resurrection, or the use of the apocryphal text of the Bible, or the use of the apocryphal character of the story. In the apologetical oration the doctrinal system of Arianism is visible.
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LUKE.

are found in Migne: PatroL Latin, xiii. See Tillemont: Memóres, vii. W. Möller.

LUCIUS is the name of three popes. — Lucius I. (January 253—March 5, 254), the successor of Cornelius. The length of his reign varies, in the different sources, between eight months, ten days, and three years, eight months, ten days; but the former account is by far the more probable (see Lipsius: Chronologie der römischen Bischöfe, Kiel, 1889). From a letter by Cyprian (61, ed. Hartelt), it appears that Lucius was banished for a short time; from another (68), that he wrote some letters concerning the reconciliation of thelapsi. — Lucius II. (March 12, 1144—Feb. 16, 1145). His short reign was much disturbed. A revolt took place in Rome under the leadership of Giordano Frileone, who was declared patricius. A new senate was elected; and the Pope was asked to renounce all power and rights and privileges, except those belonging to a bishop of the primitive church. Lucius addressed himself to Conrad III. for aid, but in vain. He succeeded, however, in uniting the Frangipani, the bitter enemies of the Pierleones, on his side; but he died before the issue of the contest was arrived at. See Wat-terich: Vita Pont. Rom., ii. 278—281; Jaffé: Regest. Pont., 610—615. — Lucius III. (Sept. 1, 1181—Nov. 25, 1185). He inherited from his predecessor, Alexander III., the bitter controversy with the Emperor Frederic I. concerning the estates of the Countess Mathilde. A compromise was proposed by the emperor, who offered to pay ten per cent of the revenues of the kingdom of Italy to the Pope, and other ten per cent to the cardinals, if the curia would renounce its claim on the estates. But the offer was not accepted. On the contrary, the Pope demanded the immediate surrender of the estates; which the emperor could not comply with, without endangering the position of the empire in Central Italy. A personal interview was finally arranged, in 1184, between the emperor and the Pope, at Verona, where Lucius generally resided. But nothing came out of the interview, except a deeper irritation on both sides. Shortly before he died, Lucius solemnly forbade his successor ever to crown Frederic's son, Henry VI. See Watterich l. c., ii. 660—662; Jaffé l. c., 635—654; Scheffer-Borchorst: Kaiser Friedrich I. und d. Kurie, 1896. Karl Müller.

LÜCKE, Gottfried Christian Friedrich, b. at Egeln, near Magdeburg, Aug. 24, 1791; b. at Göttingen, Feb. 14, 1855. He studied theology at Halle and Göttingen, began to lecture in the university of Berlin in 1818, and was appointed professor of theology at Bonn in 1818, and at Göttingen in 1827. He was a pupil and friend of Schleiermacher, and one of the ablest commentators. He tried to occupy a middle position, avoiding all extremes; and, though he did not escape the difficulty inherent in his very position, that of dissatisfying all extremists, radical as well as orthodox, he vindicated himself with great personal gifts, and exercised considerable influence on the theology of his time. His principal work is his Commentary on the writings of St. John (Gospel, Epistles, and Apocalypse), 4 vols., 1840—56; [partly translated into English, Edinburgh, 1837]. He also wrote, Grundriß der neuest. Hermeneu tik, Gottingen, 1816; Über d. neuest. Kanon d. Eusebius, Berlin, 1817; besides a number of valuable monographs in theological periodicals. Wagemann.

LUD appears in the genealogical table of Gen. 22, as the fourth son of Shem, and was already (by Josephus: Arch. 1, 6, 4) identified with the ancestor of the Lydians of Asia Minor. Though the Lydian language did not belong to the Semitic group, it must be remembered that language is not the principle on which the genealogical table of Genesis proceeds; and from other sides it appears probable that there originally existed a close connection between the Lydians and the Assyrians, as Herodotus tells us (1. 7) that the first king of the Lydians was Agros, a son of Ninus, a son of Belus.

Different from the Semitic Lud is the African Lud, who, in Gen. x. 13, appears as the first son of Mizraim. With this account agree the prophets. The Ludim are spoken of in Jer. xvi. 9, as Egyptian mercenaries, together with Cush and Put; in Ezek. xxv. 10, as mercenaries before Tyre, together with the Persians and Put; and in Isa. lxv. 19, as archers from the most distant country. Rüetschi.

LUDGERUS. See Liudgerus.

LUDIM. See Lud.

LUDLOW, John, D.D., LL.D., b. at Aquacks- nock (now Passaic), N.J., Dec. 13, 1783; d. at Philadelphia, Sept. 8, 1857. He entered the ministry of the Reformed Dutch Church in 1817; to 1823 he was pastor in New Brunswick, N.J., and professor in the theological seminary there; from 1823 to 1834, pastor in Albany; from 1834 to 1852, provost of the University of Pennsylvania; from 1852 to his death, he was professor in the New Brunswick Seminary, and professor of philosophy in Rutgers College. Ludolf, Hiob, b. at Erfurt, June 15, 1624; d. at Frankfurt-am-Main, April 8, 1794. He is noted as an Ethiopian scholar, and author of an Ethiopian grammar, Commentaries on Ethiopian history, and particularly of the great Ethiopian Lexicon (1861). He was aulic councillor to the Duke of Saxe-Gotha, and president of the Academy of History in Frankfurt. See C. Juncker: Commentarius de vita J. Ludolf (Nürnberg, 1710), and Nouvelle biographie générale.

LUITPRAND. See Liutprand.

LUKAS OF TUY (Tudensis), b. at Leon in Spain; was educated for the church; made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1227; and was in 1239 appointed bishop of Tuy in Galicia, where he died in 1290. He wrote a Chronicle of Spain from 670 to 1236, edited by Schott (Hisp. Ill., Francfort, 1603, 4 vols. folio), and a Vita et Historia Translationis S. Isidori, of which the first part, treating the life of the saint, is found in Act. Sanct., April 4; and the second, containing polemics against the Cathari, was separately edited by Mariana (Libri tres contra Albigenium errores, Ingolstadt, 1613), and is found in Bib. Patr. Max., xxx. The polemics is passionate and supercilious, but not without historical and archaeological interest. C. Schmid.

LUKE the evangelist, and author of the Acts of the Apostles; reprinted in the New Testament; and its bearer is spoken of by Paul as his
Justin Martyr and the Clementine Homilies. It is as the work of Luke, in Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Jerome, and others. We have evidence that it was used in the year 170, and that, at the close of the century, it was regarded as canonical in Asia Minor, Gaul, Italy, Egypt, and North Africa.

Luke defines the purpose of his Gospel, in the prologue, to be, to confirm a certain Theophilus in the assurance of the trustworthiness of the things he had been instructed in. Was this prologue meant to include the Acts of the Apostles, as well as the Gospel? and had the author the definite plan of writing both works when he put his pen to the Gospel? This cannot by any means be affirmed with certainty. Luther thought the object of the Acts was to hold up before the world the great doctrine that we are all justified by faith, without the works of the law. Towards the end of the last century, Griesbach affirmed its purpose to be apologetic,—to vindicate Paul over against the Judaizing party. Schneckenburger, with his customary acuteness (Ueber d. Zweck d. Apg., 1841), carried this theory farther by emphasizing the difference between Peter and Paul. According to Baur and the Tübingen school, however, the Acts has a conciliatory aim. It was written by a representative of the Pauline school for the purpose of reconciling Pauline and Judaic Christianity. Both of these theories lack foundation. If the aim of the writer was to vindicate Paul, why did he direct his work to a Gentile (Theophilus), and to Gentile readers? Or, if it was to reconcile the Pauline and Judaizing Christians, how did the author come to lay so much stress upon the guilt of the Jews in rejecting Christ (Acts ii. 28), and the universal character of Christianity? Lekebusch (D. Composition u. Entstehung d. Apg.), and Meyer in his Commentary, have fully shown up the untenableness of these theories.

The accepted view is the true one, that the author intended to write a history, and not an apologetical tract. He, no doubt, had a definite plan; but that he set out to write a party document cannot be made out. In the Gospel, Luke makes prominent, as none of the other Gospels do, the universal aim of Christianity; and in the Acts he confirms this idea from the historical progress of Christianity. The object of the Acts is to show how Christianity passed beyond the circle of the apostles, and became firmly established among the Gentile nations.

According to Luke's prologue, many had already written accounts of Christ's life. It also appears there, that Luke had examined these, and stood in a personal relation to the "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word" (Luke i. 2). Thus his sources were twofold,—the Apostles and documentary records. In regard to the records, some have held that Luke had before him the present Gospel (or a prior Gospel) of Mark; others, the original Matthew, or both. Weiss, in his thorough acute works on the Gospels, holds that an original Matthew (the αὐτός) existed before Mark; that our present Matthew is the corrected before Mark; that our present Matthew is the corrected Mark; and finally Luke. Godet, in the course of his Commentary on Luke, tries to show its complete independence of both Matthew and Mark. But the notice in the prologue of Luke does not indicate what the records were which he used; and, at any rate, seem (Luke i. 1) that he had in mind more than two. The results of modern criticism go rather to confirm the old view, that the Gospel of Luke is older than Matthew and Mark.

The sources from which Luke drew for the Acts were, without doubt, (1) the personal reminiscences he got from Paul, Mark (Col. iv. 10, 14), Philip (Acts xxi. 8), and others (xxi. 17 sqq), (2) personal observation of his own (the latter portion of the Acts), and (3) documents.

In the concluding chapter of the Acts, Luke records that Paul continued to labor for two years as a prisoner in Rome. This book, therefore,
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could not have been written before 64. The opinion was almost unanimous, before Kaiser, De Wette, and Credner, that the Acts, as well as the Gospel, were written before the destruction of Jerusalem. This view, which is still held by Lange, Ebrard, Gedet, Van Oosterzee, [Alford, Plumptre, Farrar, Schaff, Riddle, etc.], is denied by Bleek, Reuss, Meyer, Keim, Holtzmann, and others, who hold that the description in Luke xxi. 20 sqq. presupposes the catastrophe of the destruction of Jerusalem.

It has been taken for granted in the preceding paragraphs that Luke was the author of the third Gospel and the Acts, and this must be regarded as the only tenable opinion. There can be little room for doubting that both the third Gospel and the Acts are by the same author. The style, both in the construction of the sentences and the use of words, as well as the agreement in doctrine, go to prove this. Schleiermacher originated the hypothesis, which Bleek and De Wette followed, that the passages in Acts in which the author places himself among the eye-witnesses of the events narrated, using the pronoun “we” (Acts xvi. 10-17, xx. 5-18, xxii. 1-16, xxvii. 1-xxviii. 16), are by Timothy. But this view lacks all foundation, and is directly contradicted by such passages as Acts xx. 4 sq. The Tübingen school has denied that Luke is the author of Acts, on the ground of alleged inaccuracies of statement, which are shown up in a comparison with the Epistles of Paul and the subsequent course of history (see Acts xv., xxi. 25), and of the whole relation which the author represents Paul as holding to the Jews, and which a companion of Paul could not have done. Many passages have been declared unhistorical, but simply on the ground that they relate miraculous cures; or because Paul could not have given the account of the vision on the way to Damascus, or have accommodated himself to the Nazarite’s vow (Acts xxii. 24-27). But all such criticism is assumption. Why did the writer, if he belonged to a later age, break off abruptly with Paul as a prisoner in Rome? There is no other tenable explanation than that held by the early Church, that Luke was the author of the Acts as well as of the third Gospel. The modern hypotheses have furnished by their inconclusiveness a negative argument in confirmation of this view.

Writers of the early church were inclined to ascribe a part of the Gospel to Paul. Irenaeus (Her. iii. 1) and Eusebius expressly affirm that Luke put down the Gospel he received from Paul. Origen held the same view (Euseb. vi. 25). From these testimonies it seems to be beyond dispute that Paul exerted a decisive influence upon the theological views of Luke. The third Gospel is the only one of the four which bears the unmistakable impress of the Pauline spirit. Besides special coincidences (e.g., Luke xxii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 13 sqq.), it is the freedom of divine grace, and the universality of the plan of salvation, which characterize the Gospel. Illustrations may be mentioned Luke iii. 22-38 (which gives the descent of Jesus from Adam and God), ii. 31, 32, iv. 25-27, ix. 52-56, x. 1-24 (the mission of the seventy), 30-37, xvii. 11-19, etc.

The Acts has not such a decided Pauline cast, or, at least, it is not made so prominent. Comparatively few of the characteristic ideas of Christianity are brought out. The ever-recurring ideas are the necessity of repentance, faith in Christ as the crucified (according to God’s plan) and risen Saviour, and baptism in his name. Nowhere do we find the authors directly combating the views of the Judaic party, as Paul does in his Epistles (Galatians, etc.). The work appears as an historical commentary upon Paul’s fundamental principle,—the gospel for the Jews first, but none the less for the Gentiles. In general, it refutes, by the succession of events it details, the Judaistic attacks upon Paul. It may be said to be generally acknowledged that Luke follows a definite method. He is the first of the evangelists who proceeds on an historical plan. The words of the prologue of the Gospel (Luke i. 3), “It seemed good to me . . . to write unto thee in order,” at first make the impression that Luke followed a chronological arrangement; but a perusal of the Gospel shows that he was as much influenced by considerations of the matter as of time. After detailing the events of the infancy of Jesus, he divides his healing activity into three periods: (1) Galilean ministry (iv. 14—ix. 50); (2) Journeying towards Jerusalem (ix. 51—xiii. 27, or xvii. 1—xxvii. 4), a section which, for the most part, is peculiar to Luke; (3) Arrival, activity, and death in Jerusalem, and the resurrection (xix. 28—xxiv. 53).

The arrangement of the Acts surprises us by its correspondence with the arrangement of the Gospel. We may look upon it as an historical demonstration of the fulfilment of the Lord’s command to his disciples (Acts i. 8) to be his witnesses (1) in Jerusalem, (2) all Judaea and Samaria, and (3) to the uttermost part of the earth. The present division into two parts: (1) i.—xii., in which Peter is the central figure, and (2) xiii.—xxvi., in which Paul is the central figure—must be given up. As in the Gospel, so here, we find an introduction (Acts i.), giving an account of the ascension, and completion of the number of the apostles. The rest of the book falls into three periods: (1) i.—vii., in which Paul finds a church at Jerusalem (ii.—vi. 7); (2) Transition to labors among the Gentiles (vi. 8—xxi.); (3) Founding and confirmation of the churches in Asia and Europe, and the last labors of Paul (xxii.—xxxviii.).

LUKE OF PRAGUE.

1362

LUULLUS.


LUKE OF PRAGUE, b. about 1460; d. at Zungenbunzlau, Dec. 11, 1528; studied at the university of Prague; joined the Moravian Brethren of St. John of Nepomuk in 1524; entered the monastery of Fulda, where he died in 1528; became in 1518 president of their ecclesiastical council. In 1491 he was sent by the Unitas Fratrum on a mission to Greece and the Orient, in order to discover some body of Christianity; and with inexhaustible energy he concentrated the whole fantastic exuberance of his mind on the representation of that science, and provided with sufficient knowledge of the Oriental languages, in order to apply it according to its chief purpose.

From the church and the popes, whom he never grew tired of soliciting, he received no aid. At the Council of Vienne (1515) he barely succeeded in having chairs of Oriental languages established at Paris, Oxford, and Salamanca. A little more encouragement he obtained from the kings of France and Aragon, and from the universities; he having taught his science at various times and places with great success. What he did he had to do unaided. He learned Arabic, and made three missionary tours himself among the Saracens. The first time, he went from Genoa to Bugia, the capital of Tunis (1292); challenged the Arab scholars to a formal disputation ; made, as it would seem, considerable impression, but was, for that very reason, ordered to leave the country. The second time, he went from Spain to Bugia (1309); visited Algiers and Tunis, but was in Bugia rescued from the fury of the mob only by the aid of an Arab philosopher, Homer. The third time, he went again directly to Bugia (1314), and kept, for some time, quiet among the Christian merchants; but, when he began to preach publicly against Islam, he was stoned out of the city, and left dying on the seashore. A Christian seacaptain found him, and brought him on board his vessel; but he expired shortly after (June 30, 1315), thus sealing by his death the great idea of his life,— to conquer Islam, not by the sword, but by preaching.

The writings of Lullus, in Latin, Arabic, and Spanish, are very numerous. A catalogue in the Library of the Escorial enumerates four hundred and thirty, and the number agrees with that given by Wadding (Scriptores Min.) and N. Antonio (Biblioth. Hist. Vet., ii. 129). Most of these writings, however, remain unpublished in Spanish, French, and German libraries. Published are those of his works which pertain to his new science, *Opera qua ad artem universalem pertinent*, Strassburg, 1588, and often afterwards. His *Magnus ars curiosa doctrina* is a curious development of scholasticism, made, indeed, a kind of sensation in its time, and exercises still a kind of fascination on the student. Of great interest are also his works against Averroes and the Averroists, *Duodecin principia philosophiae contra Averroistos; De repugnatione Averrou*; *Liber contradictionum inter R. et Averroistam, etc.* His *Observationes* were published at Palma, 1859. A collected edition of his works, by Ivo Salzinger (Mayence, 1721—42, in 10 vols.), was never completed.

LULLUS, an Anglo-Saxon by birth, was for many years the friend and assistant of Boniface, and was by him ordained a bishop, and nominated his successor in the see of Mayence. His ambition, it would seem, implicated him in a long controversy with Abbot Sturm of Fulda, another disciple of Boniface, who endeavored to vindicate the independence of his monastery against ecclesiastical council. In 1491 he was sent by the *Unitas Fratrum* on a mission to Greece and the Orient, in order to discover some body of Christianity; and with inexhaustible energy he concentrated the whole fantastic exuberance of his mind on the representation of that science, and provided with sufficient knowledge of the Oriental languages, in order to apply it according to its chief purpose.

From the church and the popes, whom he never grew tired of soliciting, he received no aid. At the Council of Vienne (1515) he barely succeeded in having chairs of Oriental languages established at Paris, Oxford, and Salamanca. A little more encouragement he obtained from the kings of France and Aragon, and from the universities; he having taught his science at various times and places with great success. What he did he had to do unaided. He learned Arabic, and made three missionary tours himself among the Saracens. The first time, he went from Genoa to Bugia, the capital of Tunis (1292); challenged the Arab scholars to a formal disputation ; made, as it would seem, considerable impression, but was, for that very reason, ordered to leave the country. The second time, he went from Spain to Bugia (1309); visited Algiers and Tunis, but was in Bugia rescued from the fury of the mob only by the aid of an Arab philosopher, Homer. The third time, he went again directly to Bugia (1314), and kept, for some time, quiet among the Christian merchants; but, when he began to preach publicly against Islam, he was stoned out of the city, and left dying on the seashore. A Christian sea-captain found him, and brought him on board his vessel; but he expired shortly after (June 30, 1315), thus sealing by his death the great idea of his life,— to conquer Islam, not by the sword, but by preaching.

The writings of Lullus, in Latin, Arabic, and Spanish, are very numerous. A catalogue in the Library of the Escorial enumerates four hundred and thirty, and the number agrees with that given by Wadding (Scriptores Min.) and N. Antonio (Biblioth. Hist. Vet., ii. 129). Most of these writings, however, remain unpublished in Spanish, French, and German libraries. Published are those of his works which pertain to his new science, *Opera qua ad artem universalem pertinent*, Strassburg, 1588, and often afterwards. His *Magnus ars curiosa doctrina* is a curious development of scholasticism, made, indeed, a kind of sensation in its time, and exercises still a kind of fascination on the student. Of great interest are also his works against Averroes and the Averroists, *Duodecin principia philosophiae contra Averroistos; De repugnatione Averrou*; *Liber contradictionum inter R. et Averroistam, etc.* His *Observationes* were published at Palma, 1859. A collected edition of his works, by Ivo Salzinger (Mayence, 1721—42, in 10 vols.), was never completed.

LULLUS, an Anglo-Saxon by birth, was for many years the friend and assistant of Boniface, and was by him ordained a bishop, and nominated his successor in the see of Mayence. His ambition, it would seem, implicated him in a long controversy with Abbot Sturm of Fulda, another disciple of Boniface, who endeavored to vindicate the independence of his monastery against ecclesiastical council. In 1491 he was sent by the *Unitas Fratrum* on a mission to Greece and the Orient, in order to discover some body of Christianity; and with inexhaustible energy he concentrated the whole fantastic exuberance of his mind on the representation of that science, and provided with sufficient knowledge of the Oriental languages, in order to apply it according to its chief purpose.

From the church and the popes, whom he never grew tired of soliciting, he received no aid. At the Council of Vienne (1515) he barely succeeded in having chairs of Oriental languages established at Paris, Oxford, and Salamanca. A little more encouragement he obtained from the kings of France and Aragon, and from the universities; he having taught his science at various times and places with great success. What he did he had to do unaided. He learned Arabic, and made three missionary tours himself among the Saracens. The first time, he went from Genoa to Bugia, the capital of Tunis (1292); challenged the Arab scholars to a formal disputation ; made, as it would seem, considerable impression, but was, for that very reason, ordered to leave the country. The second time, he went from Spain to Bugia (1309); visited Algiers and Tunis, but was in Bugia rescued from the fury of the mob only by the aid of an Arab philosopher, Homer. The third time, he went again directly to Bugia (1314), and kept, for some time, quiet among the Christian merchants; but, when he began to preach publicly against Islam, he was stoned out of the city, and left dying on the seashore. A Christian sea-captain found him, and brought him on board his vessel; but he expired shortly after (June 30, 1315), thus sealing by his death the great idea of his life,— to conquer Islam, not by the sword, but by preaching.

The writings of Lullus, in Latin, Arabic, and Spanish, are very numerous. A catalogue in the Library of the Escorial enumerates four hundred and thirty, and the number agrees with that given by Wadding (Scriptores Min.) and N. Antonio (Biblioth. Hist. Vet., ii. 129). Most of these writings, however, remain unpublished in Spanish, French, and German libraries. Published are those of his works which pertain to his new science, *Opera qua ad artem universalem pertinent*, Strassburg, 1588, and often afterwards. His *Magnus ars curiosa doctrina* is a curious development of scholasticism, made, indeed, a kind of sensation in its time, and exercises still a kind of fascination on the student. Of great interest are also his works against Averroes and the Averroists, *Duodecin principia philosophiae contra Averroistos; De repugnatione Averrou*; *Liber contradictionum inter R. et Averroistam, etc.* His *Observationes* were published at Palma, 1859. A collected edition of his works, by Ivo Salzinger (Mayence, 1721—42, in 10 vols.), was never completed.
The church long hesitated, not knowing whether she should recognize Lullus as a martyr and saint, or condemn him as a heretic. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, Antonino, Wadding, and others, and, among Protestant church historians, by Neander, See FELBOGET: Vie de B. L., Vendome, 1867; LOW. De vita R. L., Halle, 1830; HELFLECH: R. L., Berlin, 1858; WAGENMANN.

LUNA, Peter de. See Benedict XIII.

LUPUS, Servatus, b. about 803; was educated in the monastery of Ferrières, in the diocese of Sens; studied afterwards at Fulda, under Rabanus Maurus, 827-837; lived for some time at the court of Louis the Pious; and was by Charles the Bald made abbot of Ferrières, instead of Odo, 842. He died after 862, but the exact date is unknown. From his letters it appears that he was well acquainted with all the more prominent ecclesiastics of his day, and took a lively interest in all church affairs. In the controversy between Gottschalck and Hincmar he sided with the former, and defended him by letters, by larger works (De tribus questionibus et Collectaneum), and at the synods. His works were first edited by Baluzé, Paris, 1661; afterwards often, as, for instance, in Migne: Patro. cxix. See NICOLAS: Études sur les lettres de Servat-Loup, Paris, 1861; F. SPUFF: Servatus Lupus, Ratisbon, 1880. W. MÖLLER.

LUTHER, Martin, the German Reformer, was b. at Eisleben, a town in Saxony, not far from Wittenberg, Nov. 10, 1483; d. at the same place, Feb. 18, 1546. His father was a miner, but had been a "genuine peasant" (rechter Bauer), as his son himself once said. His mother is specially praised by Melanchthon for her "modesty, fear of God, and habits of prayer." They brought up Martin very strictly, but left upon his mind an indelible impression of moral earnestness and honesty. He was sent to the Latin school of Mansfeld, from which he passed in 1497 to Magdeburg, and 1498 to Eisenach, where he had relatives. With others of the poorer boys, he sang in front of the houses, asking for bread for God's sake (panem propter Deum); and attracting the notice of Ursula, the wife of Kunz Cotta, he was taken in and kindly treated by her. Trebonius was then teaching at Eisenach; and Melanchthon says that the scholar from the devil, and is the fundamental sin. It requires the renunciation of the selfish will, which would not be quieted, induced him to form the sudden resolution of becoming a monk. Terrified by a storm, he entered the Augustinian convent at Erfurt, July 17, 1505, and in 1507 was ordained priest. He was zealous in the practice of the monastic rules, but less versed in the study of theology, and almost committed to memory the works of Gabriel Biel and D'Ailly, while he sedulously read Occam and Gerson. But the conflict going on in his soul, and the doubts of his own salvation, pious exercises failed to put to rest. In spite of these, these doubts grew more insidious; but he eagerly caught at the advice of an old teacher of the convent, who directed him to the article on the forgiveness of sins. It was, however, the vicar of the order, John of Staupitz, who became his most influential human guide. But that which was decisive in this stage of his experience was the Bible, in the study of which he immersed himself.

In 1508 Luther was called to the chair of philosophy at the university of Wittenberg. He was subsequently, for some unknown cause, called back to Erfurt, remaining there three terms (Semester), and was despatched in 1511 to Rome, in the interests of his order. The exhibitions of ecclesiastical corruption which came under his observation did not at the time occasion any revolt in his mind. At a later period he voluntarily became the assistant of the city preacher of Wittenberg, and professed for some time a evangelical earnestness. Mind turning away from philosophy, he earnestly sought for the kernel of the nut and the marrow of the bones (nucleum nucis, medullam ossium, Ep. i. 6). He sought to present to his hearers the saving truth, especially from the Epistle to the Romans and the Psalms; and it was in the study of these books, that, as Melanchthon has said, the light of the gospel first dawned on him. We possess a manuscript of his lectures upon the Psalms, delivered between 1513 and 1516. Amongst the human instruments who influenced his opinions, Augustine was the chief. And at this period Luther taught the righteousness which is God-given; and he even had a deeper understanding of the meaning of faith, the "short way" to that righteousness, than Augustine himself. In 1516 he became acquainted with, and was strongly influenced by, the Thomistic mysticism of Taube, in his German Theology, of which he published editions in 1516 and 1518. Although he had not yet broken with the Catholic Church, he had already come substantially to his later views on the plan of salvation. In agreement with the teaching of the mystics, he regarded as fundamental the personal relation of the individual to Christ by faith. Faith he identified with pure and unselfish devotion. It requires the renunciation of the selfish will, which comes from the devil, and is the fundamental sin. Faith and hope go out to Christ, who alone has fulfilled the law, and was crucified for us; so that we can say, "Thou art my righteousness, but I am thy sin" (ca justitia meas, ego autem sum peccatum tuum).

Luther was not aware that his beliefs were in conflict with the opinions with which at that time prevailed in the Church. In opposition to the then custom, he called upon the bishops to recognize preaching as the principal duty of their office; and held that the sermon ought to be free from expressions of human opinion, legendary stories, and the like, and should go beyond the department of morals and works, to that of faith and imputed righteousness. The thought never occurred to him that his views were not in accord with those of the Church; and the idea
had not yet crossed his mind of doubting its supreme authority. Nothing is more striking than his utter failure to observe that he was holding views contrary to those of the Church, and even of Augustine and the mystics. This fact is as remarkable as the evidence of negation and simple critical reflection, but a spirit of positive and private thought, which produced his views.

Luther's writings of this period, in which these views are expressed, are a volume of Sermons (1515), which the author wrote down in Latin, an Introduction to the German Theology (1518), an Exposition of the Seven Penitential Psalms (his first German work), the Our Father (1517), and Sermons on the Decalogue (1518). His Letters also admit us into the state of his mind. Compare Hering: D. Mystik Luthers, 1878.

It was the sale of indulgences in the vicinity of Wittenberg, by Tetzel, under the commission of the Archbishop of Mainz, which formed the occasion for Luther's first conflict with the Church; not, as he thought, against the Church, but for its honor. He began by warning against the abuse of indulgences, at the confession and from the pulpit. He next embodied his opposition in Letters to the Magnates of the Church, at least to the Bishop of Brandenburg and the Archbishop of Mainz. With the letter to the latter, he sent the ninety-five theses with which he opened the battle with Tetzel, nailing them, on Oct. 31, 1517, to the door of the Schlosskirche (Castle Church) at Wittenberg. They contained what his sermons had already taught; namely, that Jesus' call to repentance demands that the whole life shall be an act of repentance, and does not refer to priestly confession and penance. The Pope's indulgence cannot remove the guilt of the smallest transgression: it can only pardon guilt in the sense of announcing what God has already done. The gospel is the real treasure of the church. Luther also allowed a sermon (Von Ablass und Gnade) to appear, in which he warned against the use of indulgences.

What Luther was led by an irrepressible conviction to speak out, met with a favor in Germany of which he had not had the slightest presentiment. The theses went through the entire land in fourteen days, for everybody complained about the indulgences; and while all the bishops and doctors were silent, and no one was found to bell the cat, it was noise about that one Luther had at last attempted the task. Luther was driven to further utterances by the attacks of Tetzel, the Dominican Priestias, the Ingolstadt chancellor John Eck, and Hoogstraten. He answered all four tracts, of which the most celebrated is the one against Eck, — Asterisci adv. obelisc. Eccii. His most important work on the question of the indulgences was his Resoluciones disputationum de indulgentiarum virtute, 1518. Two new questions were suggested to him in this controversy; namely, that the efficacy of the indulgences was intrusted to an individual, and that the Pope did not possess supreme authority. He was branded as a heretic by his opponents, and cited to appear at Rome; and the cardinal legate Cajetan was appointed, for the time being, to bring him into submission. With this last purpose in view, a conference was held at Augsburg (October, 1518); but Luther insisted that he was a true son of the Church, and, refusing to recall his utterances regarding the Pope's authority and the efficacy of the sacrament, appealed finally from the Pope to a general council. He boldly asserts that there had been a time in the history of the Church when there was no papal primacy, and this primacy did not belong to the essence of the true Church.

The Pope still hesitated to break with the Elector of Saxony, who was unwilling to deliver Luther up, and despatched his chamberlain, Miltitz, who succeeded (January, 1519) in inducing Luther to promise silence for the time being, and to write a letter to the Pope, expressing his veneration for the Roman Church. But in this very letter, while he allows the doctrines of the invocation of saints and purgatory, he boldly asserts that he cannot believe that an indulgence affects the condition of the soul in purgatory. He, however, felt no longer bound by his promise of silence, when Eck challenged his colleague, Karlstadt, to a disputation to be held in Leipzig. Exposing the part of the indulgences, he disputed against Eck from June 27 to July 18, 1519. (Compare Seidelmann: D. Leipziger Disputation, 1845, and art. Eck.) Eck sought to prove, from Luther's own confession, that he had fallen away from the church. Luther, on the other hand, expressed himself with boldness, denying the divine right of the Pope as primate, and affirming that the power of the keys was intrusted, not to an individual, but to the Church; that is, the body of believers. Hus's, or rather Augustine's, words were true, that there is one holy and universal Church, which is the totality of the elect (predestinatio universitas): hence the Greek Church was not heretical. Further: he affirmed, that among the clauses which the Council of Constance at the trial of Hus condemned as heretical were those that were genuinely evangelical. Thus he denied the infallibility of general councils.

The Reformer is described at this time as having been very popular, on account of study, fertile in words and illustrations in his sermons, and cheerful and friendly in his intercourse. In debate he displayed a wonderful freshness and vigor, fearless boldness, and also a rude vehemence, which he did not succeed in suppressing. In 1519 he published his university lectures on Galatians, in his smaller Commentary, and a work on the Psalms (Operationes in Psalmos).

His fame had grown wonderfully, and multitudes of students flocked to Wittenberg to hear him. He entered into correspondence with, and received deputations from, the Utraquists of Bohemia, and from Italy. The Humanists, too, began to show him their sympathy. Melanchthon, a young representative of this tendency, stood at his side from 1618 on. Luther wrote to Reuchlin; and in a letter to Erasmus, under date of March 28, 1516, he expressed his esteem for that scholar. Primarily upon the fact of his having been placed under the protection; and Franz of Sickingen and Silvester of Schauenberg offered him a place of safety in their castles. In this condition of affairs Luther sent forth an appeal to the Christian noblemen of Germany. August, 1520 (An den christl. Adel deutscher Nation), urging them
as laymen to take up the work of ecclesiastical reformation, which the Pope had refused, and advocating the suppression of conventual establishments for nuns, the abolition of the interdict and the ban, the recognition of the independence of the Pope over the Church, the doctrine of transubstantiation, etc. The tract De Captivitate Babylon. ("The Babylonish Captivity," that is, under the Papacy), which appeared about this time, expressed the Reformer’s views on the sacraments, only three of which he retained,— the Lord’s Supper, baptism, and repentance,— and in the strict sense only two. He denied transubstantiation, and the sacrifice of the mass, and baptismal regeneration. The prominent features of the plan of salvation and the Christian life were brought out in the work, Von der Freiheit e. Christenmännern ("The Freedom of a Christian Man"). He emphasized personal union with Christ, in whom we are justified by the instrumentality of the Word and faith. These three works may be fitly denominated as the most important ones for the progress of the Reformation, from his pen.

On Sept. 21 Eck appeared in Meissen, with the papal ban; but Luther retorted by burning (Dec. 12) the papal bull and decretales at Wittenberg. He justified this action in the tracts, Warum den Papstes u. seiner Jünger Bücher verbrannt sind ("Why the Books of the Pope and his Disciples were burned"), and Assertio omnium articulorum, etc. The ban was the last resort of the papal court; but the emperor (Charles V.) did not feel free to execute it, and Luther was invited to appear before the princes of the empire at Worms. He awaited the result of the diet with composure of mind, carrying on in the interval controversies with Emser ("the scribbler of Dresden") and others. He journeyed towards the city, trusting in God, and defying the Devil. The only matter which concerned him was the victory of the truth, refusing any compromise with the princes, who would gladly have taken this occasion to get redress for some of their grievances against the Pope. The first (April 17, 1521) and last question put to him was whether he was willing to renounce his writings. After a day’s consideration, he answered in the negative, but expressed his willingness to renounce them if they were shown to contain errors. His final answer to their reiterated demands was, "I shall not be convinced, except by the testimony of the Scriptures, or plain reason; for I believe neither the pope nor councils alone, as it is manifest that they have often erred and contradicted themselves. . . . I am not able to recall, nor do I wish to recall, any thing; for it is neither safe nor honest to do anything against conscience. Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise. God help me. Amen!" (Hier stehe ich, ich kann nicht anders; Gott helf mir, Amen!’) In vain were all endeavors, in public and by a private commission of the Archbishop of Treves, to move him; and his insistence upon the article condemned by the council was the period of construction, not only in opposition to the activity of pulling down, but also to that of laying foundations. In the retirement of the castle, which he called his Patmos, he had time for quiet reflection and for the translation of the New Testament into German, which contributed more than anything else to make the Reformation permanent. It was printed in September, 1522, and has continued ever since to be the model of German style. See the excellent article, German Bible Translations, in this volume. He also wrote the first part of his German Paréllèle here, and a number of tracts and letters. Outside the Wartburg, changes were going forward. Melanchthon denied the validity of monkish vows. Changes were made in the public services at Wittenberg, and the celebration of the mass abolished. Luther uttered his views upon these subjects in his De voit manu, and in a tract entitled ganda misa privata. But he was conservative, and strongly opposed the tumultuous interference with the celebration of the mass, and other old customs. Karlstadt (at Wittenberg) denounced the use of pictures in the churches, and three fanatics arrived from Zwickau, who professed to be the subjects of visions, denounced infant baptism, and advocated a wholesale destruction of the ungodly. Even Melanchthon was at first carried away by them. But Luther spoke out with his accustomed clearness and positiveness against all such errors. The Zwickauc prophets, he declared, ought to show their credentials: for God never sent an agent without them. As for infant baptism, children, it is true, could not believe; but faith might be given to them in answer to the prayers of their sponsors, and a positive warrant for it is given in Matt. xix.

Luther left the Wartburg in March, unable longer to bear the retirement. Arriving at Wittenberg on the 7th, he preached eight sermons in succession on the duties of love, order, and moderation; and the Zwickauer prophets shook the dust from off their feet as they left the city. Luther made public in 1523 a new order of service (Formula missae et communio), in which he took notice of the scruples of the weaker brethren. A subject in which he took a great interest was the revival of German devotional song; and in 1524 the first Wittenberg hymn-book appeared, with four hymns by Luther himself. About this time Duke George of Saxony forbade the circulation of Luther’s writings. This formed the occasion for the Reformer’s work upon the extent to which obedience is due to the civil authorities (Schrift über d. weltliche Obrigkeit, wie weit man ihr Gehorsam schuldig sei). He admits their supreme jurisdiction over the temporal affairs of men, and under the title of counsel author counsellors to bear with the punishment of the laws forbidding the circulation of evangelical writings, but to disobey them. He denied to them the right of making laws for the spiritual concerns of man, or to compel conformity in matters of faith. At a later period he advocated the protection of the re-
formed Church by the civil power. He also entered into a controversy with Henry VIII. of England, who had answered his book on the sacraments (De Captivitate Babylon.), and wrote a work (Contra Henricum Regem) in which he displays all his rudeness of temper. But in 1525 he showed his kindliness of disposition by a request to the king for forgiveness, which was as humble as it was unsuccessful.

The most important event in Luther's conflict with Catholicism, his difference with Erasmus, now occurred. They had been on intimate terms; but Erasmus had long since taken offence at Luther's bluntness, as Luther had taken offence at his ignorance of the method of divine grace, and lack of positiveness and courage. In 1525 Erasmus put forward against Luther a work advocating the freedom of the will (De libero arbitrio), which, after long delay, Luther answered (1525) in his De servio arbitrio, in which he insists upon the impotence of the will. He teaches that God, who knows all things, has predestinated all things, and those who are lost are lost in conformity with his predestination. If it be objected that he is able to, and yet does not, change what he does is right, and the reasons for his acting or not acting belong to the mysteries of his majesty. This is the highest stage of faith, to believe that he is clement who saves so few, and just, who makes us damnable (capable of condemnation) of his own will (sua voluntate nos damnables facit). Free-will can be predicated of God alone, and man's will is in all things subject to and ruled by the will of God. Luther desired to have these hard-sounding doctrines made public, but warned against attempts to scrutinize the hidden will of God, and urged implicit trust in his revealed Word.

Luther now had to contend principally against the spirit of false freedom, a foe which was making itself felt more and more in the Church. Karlstadt represented this spirit, and denied the presence of Christ's body in the Lord's Supper; professed an intense spiritualism, but, on the other hand, regarded polygamy as admissible, etc. In the mean time, other ecclesiastical and social changes were proposed, such as the revival of the Mosaic jubilee year, in which all property should revert to its original possessors. Müntzer, the leader of the Zwickau fanatics, labored to bring about a revolution for the establishment of a kingdom of saints, as he understood it. Luther opposed Karlstadt's tendency in the larger work (Wider die himmelischen Propheten), and answered the argument from the Mosaic law, that Christ had abolished it, and had himself become a law to us. But he admitted that many excellent models were to be derived from Moses in the department of civil government; but such commands derive their power amongst Christians, not because they originated with Moses, but because they are enjoined by the civil authority. The fire, however, was spreading, and the long-feared revolution threatened to break out in the Peasants' War. Luther openly denounced Müntzer as a false prophet, but the peasant rises in southern Germany he sought to convince that the freedom of the Christian was not a carnal freedom. The strongest words he directed to the princes; and, inasmuch as the murderous and looting gangs continued to spread dismay, he called upon them in God's name to strike down the devilish opposition with stabbing, striking, and throttling (Stecken, Schlagen, und Würgen). See the tracts Ermahnung zum Frieden, etc. ("Exhortation to Peace"), und Sendbrief von d. harten Büchlein ("The Severe Tract"). In this period of trial, hearing of intended attempts upon his own life, and feeling himself about to die, he married (June 13, 1525), without experiencing the passion of love. Catharina von Bora, who had been a nun. He did it in a spirit of noble defiance against his enemies, in order before his death to give another testimony of his esteem for the marriage-relation, as well as in the hope that the angels would laugh, and the devils weep, at the contempt he would thereby show for the papal rule of celibacy.

Luther's attention continued to be given to matters of church organization and worship. In 1526 he wrote his book, Deutsche Messe, etc. ("The German Mass"), in which he advocates weekly services and the study of the books of the Bible. He also urged catechetical instruction, but warned against making church services mere forms and formularies. The alteration of the service of baptism is noticed in the Taufbiichlein (1523, 1527). The first evangelical ordination occurred at Wittenberg, in May, 1525. The discipline of the church was now perfected, and the rights and duties of the church authorities defined. They were not to compel any one to accept the faith, or frequent the services of religion, but to put down external offences. He advocated a spiritual supervision or episcopacy, which was to reside in a higher class of officers. The princes were to appoint them, and they were to institute a system of visitation for the churches. Such visitation was made between 1527 and 1529; and, as one of the results of Luther's personal observation, he wrote his two catechisms (1529).

The meaning and nature of the Lord's Supper had become the occasion of much discussion and extensive differences between the Reformers and their followers. Luther had already written against Karlstadt; and he now discovered that Zwingli, Leo Judae, and Ecolampadius also denied the real presence of the body of Christ. He hastily identified the views of the latter with those of the former, and opposed them with passionate warmth, which rose to vehemence; and imagined he detected in these "sacramentary fanatics" the revolutionary spirit of Müntzer. In 1526 he wrote against Ecolampadius, in his Preface to the Syngamma Sacramum, and also put forth a sermon against the fanatics, a larger work, in 1527 (Dass diese Worte... noch festsetchen), and, in answer to the friendly letters of Zwingli and Ecolampadius, another in 1528 (Vom Abendmahl Christi, Bekennniss). He met Zwingli and Ecolampadius at Marburg, at the suggestion of Philip of Hesse, Oct. 1–3, 1529, came to an unexpected agreement with them on all points except the Lord's Supper, and departed, refusing the right hand of fellowship, although he promised them love and peace. He held, that, although the bread and wine were not changed into the body and blood of Christ, Christ's body was spiritually present; and he appealed to the simple words of
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institution, "This is my body." He, however, constantly affirmed that the mere bread had no virtue, and that it is only by faith that we get a blessing.

This disagreement with the two Swiss Reformers was permanent, and endangered the future of the whole movement of the Reformation. It was in this anxious condition of affairs that the princes met the emperor in 1530 at Augsburg. This conference was to define finally the attitude of the empire to Protestantism. Luther, left behind by his elector, watched the progress of the assembly from Coburg. The Confession, however, which was presented at Augsburg, was written out by Melanchthon, but was the result of previous labors, in which Luther took part. Its articles, however, were not strong and positive enough to suit him; and, when the purpose of the moderate party (Melanchthon) was defeated, he could not suppress the remark that "Satan felt that your apology, Letzteuterien (the articles) misrepresented (differsimulasse) the articles on purgatory, the worship of saints, and, especially Antichrist the Pope." He suspected Melanchthon of the spirit of over-compromise, and became impatient at his delays to write, but did not obtrude his own opinions. On the other hand, he gave up all hope and desire of a reconciliation, which was impossible "unless the Pope was willing that the Papacy should be abolished." In this whole matter of the doctrinal dissent of the Reformation and the Papacy, Luther saw far deeper than Melanchthon. The emperor, threatened by the Turks from without, and for other reasons, did not proceed against the Protestants, who had entered, for mutual protection, into the Smalcald League. It had been Luther's principle that all disobedience to the imperial power in civil concerns was unjustifiable. From this position he did not, even in this emergency, retreat, but had recourse to the jurists, who held that the emperor was to be obeyed only as he followed the precedent of law, or, as they expressed it, the "emperor in his laws" was to be obeyed. This satisfied Luther's mind; and in 1531 he preached and published a sermon (Warnung an d. lieben Deutschen) advocating resistance under certain circumstances, and appealing to the authorities in the department of jurisprudence.

The Pope still expressed himself as willing to convene a general council, and despatched the legate Vergerius, who met with Luther at Wittenberg. The Reformer doubted the Pope's sincerity; but, commissioned by the elector, he wrote out articles for the council, affirming that the Pope was the "veritable Endchri$t (Endechrist), or Antichrist," and demanding that he should renounce his pretensions. The council was, of course, never held. Luther expressed his general judgment of councils in his Eclogae Leon. i. (1539). He here denied their infallibility, and affirmed that their business was alone to defend plain, fundamental doctrines of Scripture.

In the mean time, efforts were not wanting to bring about the union of the Protestants; and Luther expressed himself heartily in favor of it, and in 1537 wrote a friendly letter to the mayor of Basel, expressing the hope that the disturbed waters might settle themselves. In a letter (1538) to Bullinger he affirmed, that, ever since the Marburg Conference, he had looked up to Zwingli as a most excellent man (virum optimum). Luther showed his conciliatory temper more conspicuously in his recognition of the Bohemian Brethren, writing a Preface for the Defence of their faith, which they presented to George of Brandenburg in 1538, and another Preface, in 1538, for the Confession which they presented to King Ferdinand.

Within the limits of his own church, Luther's chief activity never lay in organization, but in the preaching and exposition of the Word. Under the head of expository writings we may mention his Sermons on Genesis (1523-24) and Leviticus, Lectures on Deuteronomy (1525), Commentary on the Psalms, Lectures on Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Nahum, Malachi, Isaiah (1527), all in Latin; and on Habakkuk, Jonah (1526), Zechariah (1528), Ezekiel xviii. xx., xxxix., and Daniel (1530), in German; again on Hosea, Micah, and Joel (after 1530), in Latin; and on Psalms, Proverbs and the Song of Solomon (1526-27). In the department of the New Testament we may mention his Sermons on 1 Peter (1528), 2 Peter and Jude (1529), Acts xv., xvi (1526); Lectures on 1 John, Titus, and 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy (1527); Sermons on John xvii. sq. (1528, 1529); again on 1 John (1530), on Matthew v.-vii. and John vi.-viii. (1526-32); Latin Lectures on Galatians (1531); and large Commentary (1535), etc. Luther continued to preach in the city church at Wittenberg, even after Bugenhagen had become pastor.

We would be mistaken if we were to imagine, that, as Luther's end drew nigh, he looked back with complete satisfaction upon the previous years of his life as a period which had witnessed the restoration of a perfect church fabric. On the contrary, while he thanked God for grace in the past, he felt very deeply the inept and the inconstant hostility of the world to the gospel, and looked forward, in anticipation, to severe trials and judgments for the church. The state of the world seemed to him to resemble its condition before the flood, or just before the fall of Jerusalem. He was indignant at the immorality of Wittenberg; and while on a journey, in the summer of 1545, he threatened not to return to his country, if circumstances should, for prudential reasons, be kept secret. The marriage took place, March 3, 1540, in the presence of Melanchthon. When the matter became known, Melanchthon was so troubled by the criticisms, that he sickened unto death; while Luther prayed earnestly for his life, and in 1538 (Ep. 4, 602) he had exclaimed that the Papacy was, after all, better suited to the world; for the world wanted to have the Devil for its god. Here we may mention his attitude towards the second marriage of Philip of Hesse. This prince, loving another woman than his wife, secured the opinion from the Reformer, that, while monogamy was the original institution of God, cases might arise to justify a second marriage. Luther should, for prudential reasons, be kept secret. The marriage took place, March 3, 1540, in the presence of Melanchthon. The matter became known, Melanchthon was so troubled by the criticisms, that he sickened unto death; while Luther prayed earnestly for his life, and in 1539, he had ventured to say, that he believed he could defend himself satisfactorily before God, though he could not do it before man.
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Catholic and Protestant churches in 1540. But Luther doubted whether they enjoyed the favor of God; nor could he sympathize with Melanchthon in his endeavors to unite the different Protestant churches by a skilful tempering of words, and he never ceased to warn against the doctrines of Zwingli in the form in which they were described by what he considered compromises of the truth, to speak out in a Short Confession of the Sacrament (1544), in which he utters himself more warmly than ever before against the "sacramentarian fanatics." Notwithstanding this vehemence, he did have the feeling of the unity of Christian brotherhood.

On Jan. 23, 1546, he went by invitation to his birthplace, Eisleben, to arbitrate a dispute between some counts. His mission was successful; but as he retired, on Feb. 17, he felt a pressure on his chest. Surrounded by friends, he repeated the words of Ps. xxxi. 5 ("Into thy hand I commit my spirit"); and, after a few moments, he was interred in the Schlosskirche at Wittenberg.

Luther's doctrinal views have already been indicated. But it must not be forgotten that he does not write as a theologian, in the strict sense, in any of his works. It was his to discern with a life-like vision, and to bear witness, rather than to formulate and systematize. He did not lack the talent for scholastic treatment, but his utterances always depended upon personal experiences. It was this general character which explains the vigor of his preaching. A distinction has been made between the Luther of an earlier and of a later period. In regard to his main doctrines, it can only be said that he now emphasized one, now another, phase, and sometimes, at the same period, seemed to contradict himself, simply because he made the one or the other aspect more prominent.

The greatest change in the general attitude of the Reformer took place between 1520 and 1525. He never recalled his utterances about the divine predestina- tion expressed in the work De servo arbitrio; but in his later period he directed his vision to God, as the God of love, revealing himself in Christ as the central point in theology.

Luther's style preserved to the end the freshness and vigor which characterized it at the beginning. His language was pungent, simple, and clear; and he kept equally free from exuberance of feeling or fancy, and dialectic subtlety. The fundamental notion of salvation he always brought to the foreground, both in his writings and sermons. He often condemned the allegorical method of interpretation, yet he himself uses it in many a passage. Characteristic were his popular wisdom and wit, which he was so skilful in employing in proverbs, fables, verses, etc. In 1530, tarrying at Cobur, he passed away the time in working over the fables of 

His family life was filled up with cheerful and patient experiences. It was very human; and his letters and table-talk present us a charming picture of his love for his wife and children, and his thought for their welfare. ("I was eminently social and domestic in disposition," says Dr. Schaff, in the American Cyclopedia, "a great lover of music and poetry, an affectionate husband and father. He liked to play with his children, and to gather with them in childlike joy around the Christmas tree.

In his letters to his wife and friends, he lays open his whole heart, and gives free vent to his native wit, harmless humor, and childlike playfulness and drollery.") In the company of others he shared heartily in festivity; but his moderation in eating was a source of constant surprise to Melanchthon, who was not able to reconcile it with the large proportions of his body. His conversa-tion was always full of salt, perhaps sometimes seeming vulgar to a delicate ear. Melanchthon, in his funeral oration, eulogized his dignified bearing under all circumstances, his sincerity of heart, his honesty of speech. He was always honorable, just, pure, and amiable.

So far as his religious experience is concerned, Luther always felt himself to be in the midst of an intense spiritual conflict, and yet was always assured of the plan of salvation, and stood un-daunted and unanxious in the midst of external perils. He felt that he was in a constant hand-to-hand struggle with the Devil; yet he was always confident that the Devil could not harm him, for whom the Devil and the world hated so intensely, he used to say, must surely lose Christ. Ambitious motives never prevail with him. From the beginning to the end, it is the consciousness of a vocation revealed to him from above which determines him to work and to struggle; and into the carrying-out of that vocation he threw his whole being. He could leave the results of his work to prove to the credulous that it was really of God. He himself was confident of it before the results appeared.

[...]

Luther stands forth as the great national hero of the German people, and the ideal of German life. Perhaps no other cultivated nation has a hero who so completely expresses the national ideal. King Arthur comes, perhaps, nearest to Luther amongst the English-speaking race. He was great in his private life, as well as in his public career. His home is the ideal of cheerfulness and song. He was great in thought, and great in action. He was a severe student, and yet skilled in the knowledge of men. He was humble in the recollection of the designs and power of a personal Satan; yet he shared heartily in the midst of all perils.

He could bear the Papacy and imperial councils, yet he fell trustingly before the cross. He was never weary, and there seemed to be no limit to his creative energy. Thus Luther stands before the German people as the type of German character. Goethe, Frederick the Great, and all others, in this regard, pale before the German Reformer. He embodies in his single person the boldness of the battle-field, the song of the musician, the joy and care of the parent, the skill of the writer, the force of the orator, and the sincerity of rugged manhood with the humility of the Christian.

As there is a constant danger that the Germans will deify Luther: so, on the other hand, for a long time, the English race failed to recognize his true worth, and to appreciate the manliness of his character. Such writers as Coleridge, and Julius Hare, and others, have given to us a better and truer conception and admiration of him. The latter says of him, "I will call this Luther a true great man,—great in intellect, in courage, affection, and integrity; one of our most lovable and precious men. ... A right spiritual hero and prophet, and, more, a true son of na-
ture and fact, for whom these centuries, and many that are to come yet, will be thankful to Heaven.”

Luther’s hymns deserve a special mention. He not only restored sacred song to the church, but was himself a hymn-writer. The greatest of his hymns is Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott, with 154 lines, written in 1527. His Hymn of Jesus, written in 1529, upon the basis of 1’s. xlvi. has rendered it into English. Carlyle’s translation—“A safe stronghold our God is still”—has succeeded best in retaining the tone of the original. This hymn is Luther in song. It is pitched in the very key of the man. Rugged and majestic, true in God, and confident, it was the defiant trumpet-blast of the Reformation, and won the heart of the world. It is the most symbolical book in the Lutheran churches.

The Catechism, or exposition, of the Christian faith, is probably the thirtieth century’s most symbolical book. It was written after the large one, and is, indeed, the ripe fruit of many exertions, the fullest expression of the Lutheran system after many trials. It is said to be, next to the Bible, the most extensively used book ever published. It became necessary because ministers and the congregations stood in need of a safe handbook in the elements of true Christianity. The Catechism appeared; in July, the small,—both appeared in 1529; but the author’s preparations for them date back to the very beginning of his reformatory activity. In 1518 Johann Schneider collected and published the various expositions of the Lord’s Prayer which Luther had given in his sermons and lectures; and Luther himself was thereby led to publish his exposition in an authentic edition. In the same year he published his Latin exposition of the Decalogue, and in 1520 these sporadic efforts came to a preliminary consummation in his Eyn kurze form der zehnen gepfleg. Eyn kurze form des Glaubens. Eyn kurze form des Vater Unserns. After 1524 Luther’s attention was very strongly drawn to the school. His An die Radherrn aller stedte deutsches lands: dass sie christliche schulen auffrichten und halten sollen caused many evangelical schools to be founded; and those schools could not fail to inculcate the expediency, not to say the indispensableness, of a short but sound and thoroughly reliable handbook in the elements of true Christianity. Finally his tour of visitation through Saxony, in 1528, brought the matter to its consummation, by showing him how sorely, in many cases, both the ministers and the congregation stood in need of such a book; and in March, next year, the large Catechism appeared; in July, the small,—both in German.

The Catechisms of Luther, however, are not the first attempts of the kind. On the contrary, they had many predecessors,—by Brez, Althammer, Lachmann, and others; but they soon took the lead. They were immediately translated into Latin (the large, by Lonicer in May, and by Obpopus in July; the small, by Sauromann in September); and the latter soon became an almost symbolical book in the Lutheran churches. It was written after the large one, and in 1539, the ripe fruit of many exertions, the full exposition after many trials. It is said to be, next to the Bible, the most extensively used book ever written. It consists of (I.) The Ten Commandments. (II.) The Creed. (III.) The Lord’s Prayer. (IV.) The Sacrament of Holy Baptism, and (V.) The Sacrament of the Altar. It was translated into German in the editions since 1564, a sixth part, Confession and Absolution, or the Power of the Keys, whose precise authorship is a little uncertain, though substantially it dates from Luther himself, and is
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LUTHERAN CHURCH. In Europe. It is the oldest, and probably the largest also, of the evangelical denominations which sprang from the Reformation of the sixteenth century. It was called after the great leader of the German Reformation (first, in derision, by Roman Catholics, then by the followers of Luther, although he himself protested against a sectarian use of his name). Its usual title is "Evangelical Lutheran Church"; "evangelical" being the name; "Lutheran," the surname. In Prussia, and other countries of Germany, where the union between Lutherans and Reformed has been introduced (since 1817), the name "Lutheran" has been abandoned, as a church title, for "Evangelical," or "Evangelical United" (evangelisch-unifer). It has its home in Germany (where it outnumbers all other Protestant denominations), and, in Scandinavia (Denmark, Sweden, Norway), where it is the established, or national church: it extends to the Baltic Provinces of Russia, and follows the German emigration and the German language to other countries, especially to the United States, where it is now one of the most numerous denominations. (See next article.) Its total (nominal) membership, including the Lutherans in the union churches, is variously put down at thirty millions (by Holtzmann and Zöpfel, in Lexikon für Theol. und Kirchenwesen, 1882, p. 458) and at forty millions (by Dr. Krauth, in Johnson's Cyclopædia, iii. 158).

I. History. — It may be divided into five periods. (1) The pentecostal or formative period of the Reformation, from the promulgation of Luther's ninety-five theses, in 1517, to the publication of the Book of Concord, 1580. (2) The period of polemical orthodoxy, in which the doctrinal system of the church was scholastically defined and analyzed in opposition to Romanism, Calvinism, and the milder and more liberal Methodist, and the milder and more liberal Melanchthonian type of Lutheranism (as represented by Calixtus), from 1560 to about 1700. (3) The period of Pietism (Spener, d. 1705; and Francke, d. 1727), or a revival of practical piety in conflict with dead orthodoxy, from 1689 (when Francke began his Collegia philobiblica in Halle) to the middle of the eighteenth century. The Pietistic movement is analogous to the Methodist revival in the Church of England, but kept within the limits of the Lutheran state churches, and did not result in a secession. (4) The period of rationalism, which gradually invaded the universities, pulpits, and highest judicatories, and effected a complete revolution in theology and church life, to such an extent that the few Moravian communities were for some time almost the only places of refuge for genuine piety in Germany. The pernicious and rationalistic doctrine of the new religious movement was a center of the rationalistic and theological controversy which culminated in the publication of Claus Harns' ninety-five theses against the rationalistic apocatastasis, A. D. 1817. In the same year Prussia took the lead in the union movement which brought the Lutheran and Reformed confessions under one system of government, but called forth the "Old Lutheran" re-action and secession. Since then there has been a constant conflict between evangelical and rationalistic tendencies in the Lutheran and the United Evangelical churches of Germany.

On the history of the Lutheran Reformation, see the third volume of Gieseler (the fourth in the English translation of H. B. Smith) and the special works of Marheineke and Kahnis; on the doctrinal controversies which led to the formation of the Formula of Concord, Planck, Hepp, Dormer; on the Lutheran divines in the seventeenth century, Tholuck; on the whole history, the respective sections in the compendious church histories of Hase, Guericke, Kurtz, and H. Schmid; also the arts. Luther, Melanchthon, etc.

II. THE LUTHERAN CREED AND THEOLOGY. — The Lutheran Church acknowledges the three ecumenical creeds (the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian), which it holds in common with other orthodox churches, and, besides, six specific confessions, which separate it from other churches; namely: (1) The Augsburg Confession, drawn up by Melanchthon, and presented to the Augsburg Diet in 1530 (afterwards altered by the author in the tenth article, on the Lord's Supper, 1540). This is the fundamental and most widely accepted confession of that church; some branches acknowledge no other as binding. (2) The Apology of the Augsburg Confession, also by Melanchthon (1530). (3) and (4) Two Catechisms of Luther (1529), a Larger and Smaller; the latter, for children and catechumens, is, next to Luther's best known book. (5) The Articles of Smalcald, by Luther, 1537 (strongly anti-papal). (6) The Formula of Concord, prepared by six Lutheran divines (1577) for the settlement of the Melanchthonian or synergistic, the Crypto-Calvinistic or sacramentarian, and other doctrinal controversies which agitated the Lutheran Church after the death of Luther and Melanchthon. These nine symbolical books (two confessions of the three ecumenical creeds) were officially published by order of Elector Augustus of Saxony, in Latin and German, at Leipzig and Dresden, in 1580, under the title Concordia, usually called The Book of Concord. The best editions, next to the editio princeps, are by J. G. Walch (1750), J. F. Muller (1847, 3d ed. 1880); and the best English translation by Professor Henry E. Jacobs (of Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Penn.), under the title The Book of Concord; or, the Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Translated from the Original Languages, with Notes. Philadelphia (G. W. Frederick), 1882 (471 pages).
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On the three different branches of the Lutheran Church in the United States, as regards the binding authority of the symbolical books, see next article.

III. RELATION TO THE REFORMED CHURCH.—There have always been two tendencies in the Lutheran Church in its relation to the Reformed or Calvinistic churches,—one rigid and exclusive, which is represented by the Formula Concordiae, the Lutheran scholastics of the seventeenth century, and the "new Lutheran" school in Germany; the other moderate and conciliatory, represented by the altered Augsburg Confession of 1540, by Melanchthon (in his later period, after the death of Luther), Calixtus, John Arndt, Spener, Francke, Arnold, Mosheim, Bengel, the Suabian Lutherans, and those modern Lutheran divines who sympathize with the Union, and regard the differences between the two confessions as unessential, and insufficient to justify separation, and exclusion from communion at the Lord's table. The Lutheran Church is, next to the Church of England, the most conservative of the Protestant denominations, and retained many usages and ceremonies of the middle ages which the more radical zeal of Zwingli, Calvin, and Knox threw overboard as unscriptural corruptions.

The strict Lutheran creed differs from the Reformed, or Calvinistic, in four points (as detailed in the semi-symbolical Saxo-Saxon Visitations Articles of 1592); namely, (1) Baptismal regeneration, and the ordinary necessity of baptism for salvation; (2) The real presence of Christ's body and blood "in, with, and under," the bread and wine (during the sacramental fruition), usually called by English writers "consubstantiation," in distinction from the Roman-Catholic "transubstantiation;" but the term is not used in the Lutheran symbols, and is rejected by the Lutheran divines, as well as the term "impanation;" body and blood are not mixed with, nor locally included in, but sacramentally and mysteriously united with the elements; (3) The communicatio idiomatum in the doctrine of Christ's person, whereby the attributes of his humanity are consubstantial with those of his divinity, so that ubiquity (a conditional omnipresence) is ascribed to the body of Christ, enabling it to be really and truly (though not locally and carnally) present wherever the communion is celebrated; (4) The universa1 vocation of all men to salvation, with the possibility of a total and final fall from grace; yet the Formula Concordiae teaches at the same time, with Luther (De servo arbitrio) the total depravity and slavery of the human will, and an unconditional predestination of the elect to everlasting life. It is, therefore, a great mistake to identify the Lutheran system with the later Arminian theory. Melanchthon's syncretism may be said to have anticipated Arminianism, but it was condemned by the Formula of Concord.

LIT. — (1) Lutheran theologians of the strict and exclusive type. CHEMNITZ (Loci Theologici, 1655-77); KÜNG (1655); KÖNIG (1665); QUENSTEDT (1855), BAIER (1869), HOLLAZ (1750), PHILIPP (of Rostock, 2d ed., 1804-23, 8 vols.), LUTHARDT (Kompendium der Dogmatik, 1805, 6th ed., 1882), THOMASIC (a Kenoticist, Christi Person und Werk, 1858-61, 3 vols.), HEINRICH SCHMID (translated from the 5th ed. by Charles A. Hay and Henry E. Jacobs, Philadelphia, 1870, KAHNIS (Luth. Dogmatik, 1861-63, 3 vols., new ed., somewhat modified, 1874, 1875, 1876, in 2 vols.). It should be noted, however, that Thomasius' (in his doctrine of atonement), Von Hofmann (in the doctrine of atonement), and Kahnis (on the Lord's Supper), are not strictly orthodox, and depart from the Formula of Concord.

Compare also, for a merely historical statement of the system of Lutheran orthodoxy, Hase's Hutterus Rosicivus (Leipzig, 1829, 11th ed., 1868), an excellent compendium for students. Hase himself is a moderate rationalist, and gives his own views in his Lehrbuch der ev. Dogmatik, 1829, 6th ed., 1870.


The great dogmatic works of Rothe, Jul. MÜLLER (on the doctrine of sin), and Dorner, are not confessional. The Lutheran Church of the present century is exceedingly fertile in all departments of theological science, but only a small number of modern divines adhere to the old Lutheran system.

(3) On the general difference between the Lutheran and Reformed Confessions, see GÜBEL: Die religiöse Eigen tümlichkeit der luth. und reform. Kirche, 1837; SCHNECKENBURGER: Vergleichende Darstellung des luther. und reform. Christenthums (very acute and discriminating), 1855; JUL. MÜLLER: Luthert et Calvini sententiae de Sacra Cena inter se comparata, 1870, and other works quoted in Schafi's Creeds of Christendom, i. 211.

IV. RITUAL AND WORSHIP.—The foundation of the ritual of the Lutheran Church was laid in Luther's work, Von ordnung des luther. gemeinde ("The Order of Service in the Church," Wittenberg, 1523), and his Latin (Formula missae, 1523) and German missals (1528). It was his intention to retain all that was good in the service of the Catholic Church, while discarding all unevangelical doctrines and practices. Thus, in his Latin and German litanies (Latina litaniae cor recta; Die verdeckte Litanie), which were in use in 1529 at Wittenberg, he made certain corrections and additions. The Lutheran Church uses a liturgy. The first complete form, or Agenda, was that of the Duchy of Prussia, 1528. There is no authoritative form for the whole church. A movement was set on foot in 1817, by Frederick William III. of Prussia, to introduce a uniform Agenda; but it created intense excitement, and caused the Old Lutheran secession. The various states of Germany have their own Agenden, which differ, however, only in minor particulars. Luther introduced the use of the vernacular into the public services, restored preaching to its proper place, and insisted upon the participation of the congregation in the services, declaring "common prayer exceedingly useful and healthful" (valde utilis et salutaris). He rejected auricular confession,
as practised and required in the Catholic Church, but advocated private and voluntary confession. This practice has been mostly given up. The rite of exorcism, which the Reformed churches abandoned, was retained and recommended by Luther and Melancthon. Huldreich, in 1583, was the first to propose its omission; and it has since fallen into oblivion in the Lutheran Church. The popular use of hymns was introduced by Luther, who was himself an enthusiastic singer, and by his own hymns became the father of German church hymnody, which is richer than any other. (See HYMNODY.) Congregational singing continues to form one of the principal features in the public services. The great festivals of the church year—such as Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, the Days of the Twelve Apostles, etc.—are observed with religious service. A distinct English form of efficient organization is continued in the churches. These officers are appointed by the government, and "superintendents" appointed for the oversight of the congregations and schools. The Order of Discipline of the church in Saxony became the model for other books of discipline. The priesthood of all believers is a fundamental doctrine, and the parity of the clergy is recognized. In Sweden, when the whole country passed over to the Lutheran communion, the Catholic bishops retained their titles (including that of archbishop). The validity of the Swedish orders, from the stand-point of the Church of England, is a matter in dispute. The Danish Church likewise retains the title of "bishops." They have no claim, however, to apostolical succession. The first bishops under the new Danish régime were called "superintendents" (1536), and were consecrated by Bugenhagen. In Germany, church government is executed by consistories (composed of ministers and laymen) and superintendents. These officers are appointed by the government, examine candidates for the ministry, appoint and remove pastors, fix salaries, etc. In Germany, as in Denmark and Sweden, the Lutheran Church is under the governmental patronage of the various states; and the support of the congregations, and the construction of church edifices, are provided for out of the national revenues. The superintendents of Prussia since 1832 have been composed, in part of Lutheran, and in part of Reformed members. See RICHTER: D. evang. Kirchenordnungen des 16ten Jahrhunderts, 2 vols., Weimar, 1846; GESCH. d. evang. Kirchenverfassung in Deutschland, Leipzig, 1851; LEHRB. d. kathol. u. evang. Kirchenrechts (revised by DÖVE), Leipzig, 8th ed., 1877; LECHLER: GESCH. d. presbyt. u. synodal. Verfassung, Leiden, 1854; HINSCHIUS: Kirchenrecht d. Katholiken und Protestanten in Deutschland, 3 vols., Berlin, 1868—90; THUDICUM: Deutsches Kirchenrecht, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1877—78; FRISCH: Deutsches u. evang. Kirchenrechts, Leipzig, 1879. — On the general subject, see the arts: Lutheran Church by C. P. KRAUTH, in Johnson's Cyclopaedia, and in M'CLINTOCK and STRONG, v. 573 sqq. PHILIP SCHAF.

**LUTHERAN CHURCH (the Evangelical).** In the United States.—Early History. Lutherans were among the first European settlers on this continent. They multiplied in a remarkable ratio for two centuries; but for the last fifty years the progress of this church has been remarkably rapid, being promoted both by the ordinary and natural growth, and by the large and constant influx of Lutherans from Germany and Scandinavia. It now ranks third or fourth in numbers among the Protestant communities, although in national position and public influence it has not attained the eminence occupied by other denominations which in numerical strength fall much below it. This fact is due, among other causes, to the want of efficient organization, to the progress of the Reformation in this country, and especially to the continued dominance of foreign languages, but few exclusively English Lutheran churches having been thus far established in the principal cities.

The earliest representatives of Lutheranism in this country came from Holland. They formed a portion of the first Dutch colony, which in 1621 took possession of the territory now comprised in the city of New York. Holding to a confession that was at variance with that of the Netherlands Reformed Church (although never sympathizing with the Arminians), these Lutherans suffered persecution from religious intolerance, which was inflicted by the local colonial government, but instigated by the ecclesiastical authorities of Amsterdam. They never enjoyed the liberty of having their own worship, or a pastor of their faith, until the establishment of British authority in 1664. The first clergyman permitted to serve them was the Rev. Jacobus Fabricius, who arrived in 1669. Their first house of worship was erected in 1671, a rude structure, which was subsequently replaced by a more substantial edifice at the corner of Broadway and Rector Streets, where worship was for a long time conducted "exclusively in the Holland and English languages," although in course of time there were considerable accessions of German and French Lutheran colonists.

The second distinct body of Lutherans arrived upon these shores from Sweden, in 1636, the result of a project long and earnestly contemplated by that illustrious Lutheran sovereign, Gustavus Adolphus. The colony settled along the Delaware. It was accompanied by a preacher named Reorus Torkillus. He was succeeded by Rev. John Campanius, who was the first Protestant missionary among the American aborigines, and who translated Luther's Catechism into their language. It was printed in Stockholm, 1696—98, and was the first publication in an Indian tongue, except John Eliot's Indian Bible, published by Rev. John Campanius, who was the first Protestant missionary among the American aborigines, and who translated Luther's Catechism into their language. It was printed in Stockholm, 1696—98, and was the first publication in an Indian tongue, except John Eliot's Indian Bible, published by Rev. John Campanius, who was the first Protestant missionary among the American aborigines, and who translated Luther's Catechism into their language. It was printed in Stockholm, 1696—98, and was the first publication in an Indian tongue, except John Eliot's Indian Bible.
and the religious oppressions under Louis XIV. compelled to flee from the Palatinate, and to seek refuge in Protestant England, were immediately, through the beneficent patronage of Queen Anne, forwarded to America, and settled along the Hudson, some sixty miles north of New York. Large tracts of land were allotted to them for the support of Lutheran ministers and parish schools, — princely domains, from which they were subsequently cruelly defrauded by another denomination.

The Colonial Records of Pennsylvania in 1717 contain an official statement, that "great numbers of foreigners from Germany, strangers to our language and constitution, have lately been imported into the province." Most of these were Lutherans; and the same province received in 1727 another large accession of these people from Wurtemberg, the Palatinate, Hesse-Darmstadt, and other German principalities. Another considerable colony of Lutherans, driven by remorse and other German principalities. Another considerable colony of Lutherans, driven by remorseless persecution from Salzburg, crossed the Atlantic in 1734, and, through the liberality of the British Parliament and the friendly interest of the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, established themselves in Georgia just after the first English settlers had taken possession there under Gen. Oglethorpe. Their first resting-place in the New World they piously named "Ebenezer." Their descendants constitute chiefly the Evangelical Lutheran churches of Georgia and South Carolina.

The great mass of Lutherans who emigrated hither from Germany were, for the most part, unattended by clergymen. They remained, for years, destitute of the ministrations of the word and the sacraments, and the church could for a long time assume no organic form. The people, however, continued devoted to the religious principles under which they had been reared; and having brought with them their Bibles, hymn-books, and other popular manuals of devotion, and having among their number school-teachers and others who were capable of conducting religious meetings, they were "herself an assembly of private houses in barns to celebrate the worship of their church, and to nourish themselves in the faith of their fathers by observations on the Catechism, or by reading from Arndt's True Christianity, or some other deeply spiritual work of Lutheran authorship. The pastors of the Swedish churches likewise gave them some assistance, instructing the young, and administering confirmation and the sacraments.

Thus Lutheranism in this country was for a century, if not "void," yet "without form," and "darkness" brooded over its chaotic state. The people being widely scattered, wofully straitened in their circumstances, without houses of worship, pastoral oversight, or any church order, with no bond of union among themselves, nor any ecclesiastical connection with the fatherland, surrounded by fierce Indians and by more inhuman savages from Europe, preyed upon by crafty impostors, hopeless adventurers, deposed clergymen, and other false brethren and fanatics, the Lutheran Church can hardly be regarded as having a proper history till near the middle of the eighteenth century. There was no organism. Lutherans were here, but hardly a Lutheran Church. They were like scattered sheep surrounded by wolves,—a church in the wilderness. Yet so far from losing their ancestral faith, or being alienated from the religion of their youth, these people were animated with earnest longings for "the order and fellowship of their own church." They bewailed the moral devastation in the midst of which they were dwelling, and "sent imploring letters to Holland and to Germany" for spiritual guides, for teachers to instruct their children, for books, and pecuniary contributions toward the erection of houses of worship and the maintenance of churches and schools,—appeals which were not without avail. At length those Lutherans who had organized congregations in Philadelphia, New Hanover, and New Providence (the Trappe), sent a delegation of their brethren to Europe to represent their spiritual distress, to collect funds, and especially to secure proper men for the pastoral office. They were most cordially received in London by Rev. Dr. Ziegenhagen, the Luther chaplain of the English court; and in Germany, then aglow with the fervor of the earlier Pietism, "they met with warm hearts, and fervent prayers, and material aid everywhere." This was in 1738. Earnest and judicious search was made for a man who combined the peculiar qualifications of spirit, mind, and body, indispensable for the arduous work and the appalling obstacles that must be encountered in planting the Lutheran Church on American soil. After the efforts of years, the very man was found whom Providence had singled out and fitted for this great undertaking; and in the year 1742 he came to this country,—an answer to the supplications long sent up to Heaven, as well as to those carried beyond the sea. This was Henry Melchior Mühlenberg, a man of marvellous intellectual and moral power, a born leader and apostle, a heaven-ordained bishop. His arrival on these shores marks an epoch in the Lutheran Church. His herculean and far-seeing labors constitute the era of its foundation. His immortal services merit for him the title of "Patriarch of the American Lutheran Church."—Dr. W. M. Miller.

Contemporaneous with Wesley, Whitefield, and Edwards, and imbued with the spirit of churchly Pietism which he had imbibed at the university of Halle, Mühlenberg entered upon the stupendous task provisionally assigned to him. His whole course was marked by apostolical wisdom and zeal, and by an almost superhuman resolution and fortitude. He fought his great battle for several years absolutely alone, without a colleague, without a friend, indefatigably occupied on the Lord's Day in preaching, and during the week in teaching school, catechising publicly and in families, visiting from house to house, anxiously solicitous for the spiritual condition of all his parishioners, and exercising a paternal supervision and a powerful influence over the whole Lutheran population in this country. His labors were followed by genuine and extraordinary success. A worthy colleague and two assistants from the fatherland in a little while joined him, and soon there prevailed a general awakening through all the region surrounding their labors. Men were everywhere hungering for the gospel in their native tongue. Importunate and availing entreaties were sent abroad for more ministers of
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bers, efficiency, and influence. "The compara-
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This prosperity was not maintained: these
bright prospects were not realized. A period of
declension followed the general awakening which
had taken place in the days of Muhlenberg. The
Lutheran population was indeed constantly in-
creasing through the channel of immigration. In
the autumn of 1750 twenty vessels arrived in
Philadelphia with twelve thousand Germans.
Similar numbers followed in succeeding years.
About that period the Lutheran inhabitants of
Pennsylvania alone are estimated at sixty thou-
sand, and, at least, six hundred and sixty-
five ordained ministers, besides an unknown
number of lay preachers. Services of the church
were held in log huts in the woods, as well as in
rooms and cellars in the houses of the settlers.

On the death of Samuel Henry and the
departure of John Francke from Halle in 1748, the
importance of a theological seminary was appre-
ciated, and the Association of Lutheran ministers
and churches was organized in Philadelphia, in the
year 1748, under the title of "the German Evangelical
Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania." It consist-
ed of six ordained ministers, and an almost equal
number of lay representatives from the congrega-
tions. Its meetings were annual, and were at-
tended with the most beneficial results."

Similar bodies were subsequently formed,— the Minis-
terium of New York in 1785, the Synod of North
Carolina in 1803, the Synod of Ohio and Adja-
cent States in 1805, and the Synod of Maryland
and Virginia in 1819. These associations, which
greatly promoted ecclesiastical prosperity in their
respective territories, were geographically remote
from each other, destitute of any bond of union
or fellowship connecting them together, and with-
out that mutual consultation, cooperation, and
intercourse, so necessary to the general vocation
and work of the church.

At length a spirit of enlightened activity was
awakened; and an agitation for bringing these dis-
connected bodies into closer fellowship and greater
efficiency resulted, in 1820, in the establish-
ment of the General Synod,—an association with
which all the synods, except that of Ohio, united, and
which represented at the time a hundred and thirty-
five preachers and thirty-three thousand commu-
nicants. The formation of the General Synod
marks a second epoch in the Lutheran Church.
Although but advisory in its functions, and purely
negative on doctrinal tests, it became at once a
rallying and a radiating centre, and gave a power-
ful impulse to ecclesiastical enterprise, organiza-
tion, and development, not only among the Luther-
ans embraced within its bounds, but also among
those who declined to unite with it. From this
time dates the successful establishment of theo-
logical seminaries, the founding of colleges, the
formation of missionary societies and other be-
nevolent agencies for the extension of Christ's
kingdom. Remarkable prosperity and growth
succeeded; so that the denomination, which in
1820 numbered less than 150 ministers, reached
in 1893 a total of 1,365 ministers, 2,575 congre-
gations, and about 300,000 communicants. At
the time of its organization the constitution of the
General Synod was absolutely silent on con-
fessional subscription. It subsequently adopted
a substantial recognition of the Augsburg Con-
fession by requiring of the synods applying for
admission adherence to the "fundamental doc-
trines of Scripture as taught, in a manner sub-
stantially correct, in the doctrinal articles of the
Augsburg Confession," "with acknowledged devi-
ation in minor or non-fundamental points." At
the session of the General Synod at York, Penn.,
in 1854, this was supplemented by an explicit
recognition of "the Augsburg Confession as a
correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines
of the divine word, and of the faith of our church
founded upon that word." The earlier attitude
of this body towards the symbols of the Lutheran
Church was also regarded by some as too indef-
nite, and as altogether inadequate for a Lutheran

association. It proved one of the main causes which kept a number of synods aloof from the General Synod, and inspired their assaults upon it for disloyalty to the distinguishing doctrines of the church; and it confessedly tolerated teachings and practices which were at variance with historic Lutheranism, and which assimilated the church of the United States to denominations against which it had contended for centuries.

With a growing conservatism in the heart of the General Synod, a strong re-action against measures and worship not deemed in accordance with the confessions of the Church, and a fuller acquaintance among the English portion with its history and doctrines, there gradually arose a decided tendency to a stricter avowal of the Lutheran faith, and a fuller conformity to Lutheran principles and usages. A spirit of restless agitation and ecclesiastical discussion nurtured by personal and partisan contentions and by national jealousies, was given to denominational tendencies into a party, many of whose representatives were animated with the hope, that, by the pronounced adoption of all the Lutheran symbols, all those jealousies, helped to develop this tendency into an association. It proved one of the main causes of party, many of whose representatives were animate
d and practices which were at variance with historic the church; and it confessedly tolerated teachings the church. Thus the Lutheran Church, which enjoys the honor of never having sent forth any sects, finds itself, in the United States, the subject of numerous divisions, each claiming to be a purer representative of true Lutheranism than the others.

There are, besides the four general bodies, a number of synods that have never united with either of them. The main wall of partition which separates one body from another is that of doctrinal rigor or freedom, a stricter or a laxer subscription to the confessions, although, besides this, national antagonisms and jealousies are likewise powerful factors in perpetuating these divisions; the General Synod being composed almost entirely of Americans; the Synodical Conference, of Europeans; and the Concordia of a proportional proportion of both. Deplorable as is this spectacle of numerous divisions in the same household of faith, they at the same time serve to stimulate the different bodies to greater activity, and to produce a desirable rivalry, especially in the sphere of home missions, which, by the increasing myriads of foreigners who come from Lutheran lands, and by the ability of the Lutheran Church to preach to them in every needed tongue, requires emphatically the devotion and activity of all these organizations.
WORSHIP. — In cultus the Lutheran Church of the United States, as throughout the world, holds it to be unnecessary "that the same human traditions—that is, rites and ceremonies instituted by men—should be everywhere observed;" and entire liberty is allowed in the ordering of public worship. The earlier congregations continued the usage, universal in the European Lutheran churches, of a moderate liturgical service combined with extemporaneous prayers. At a later period, and especially within the pale of the General Synod, the use of prescribed forms disappeared almost entirely; and for a long time the services in the Lutheran Church conformed to the prevalent extemporaneous practices of the dominant churches around it. But, with the growing tendency toward a Lutheran self-consciousness, there has likewise arisen a wide-spread and increasing desire for the inspiring formulas of prayer and praise which are interwoven with the best period of Lutheran church-life, and which conduces to the highest spiritual worship of the congregation. The sacred forms of the ancient liturgies are regularly employed at the services of the General Synod; and the latter body recently adopted, along with the other general bodies, a common order of English service, arranged according to the consensus of the pure Lutheran liturgies of the 16th century. The general prayer is, as a rule, extemporaneous; and the sermon, in all Lutheran churches, holds the central place.

POLITY. — The American Lutherans claim, in accordance with Apol. Conf., art. XIV., that the Scriptures prescribe "no specific form of government and discipline for Christ's Church." Organization has never been a distinguishing glory of Lutheranism. The government that has generally prevailed in this country is a blending of certain principles adopted by the Congregationalists, with others that are recognized as Presbyterian. Three judicatories are acknowledged,—the council of each individual congregation; the district synod, composed of all the ministers, and one lay representative from each congregation within its bounds; and the general body, whose powers are mostly of an advisory nature, the final decision resting in all cases with the congregation. In the Synodical Conference the government is, on the one hand, strictly congregational in theory, on the other hand, really despotic in fact. When the congregation has chosen its pastor, he wields solely in his own hands the power of the keys.

Statistics for 1885.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Protestant Episcopal Synod</th>
<th>Methodist</th>
<th>Lutheran</th>
<th>Universalist</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
<th>Episcopal Synod, South</th>
<th>Synodical Conference</th>
<th>Independent Synods</th>
<th>Independent Pastors and Churches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>3,752</td>
<td>3,752</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>903,202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communi-</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>1,318</td>
<td>3,752</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Periodicals: English, 39; German, 55; Norwegian, 21; Swedish, 8; Danish, 4; Finnish, 1; Icelandic, 1. Theological Institutions, 19. Colleges, 24. Elemenary Institutions, 45. Missions in India, Africa, and among the Southern Freedmen.


LUTHERANS, Separate. When, in 1817, the union between the Lutheran and the Reformed churches was established in Prussia, the protest of J. G. Scheibel, professor of theology at Breslau, found much sympathy among the Lutherans. For several years, however, the movement was confined within the boundaries of simple, elementary polemics: but when the breaking of the bread was introduced in the administration of the Lord's Supper, by a cabinet order of 1800, Scheibel refused to obey; and, at the head of a body consisting of between two and three hundred families, he asked permission to continue administering the Lord's Supper after the old Wittenberg formula. The permission was not granted, and Scheibel left the country. In 1834, however, the government relented. But in the mean time the party had progressed very rapidly under the leadership of Husche; and the synod convened at Breslau in the same year declared that nothing would satisfy them but secession from the State church, and the formation of an independent organization. Persecutions then began. Several ministers were kept in prison for many years. A number of well-to-do laymen were reduced to poverty by money-fines. Not a few emigrated. The ministers Grabau and Von Rohr formed in America the Buffalo Synod. With the accession, however, of Friedrich Wilhelm IV., in 1840, a change took place; and July 23, 1846, the concession for the foundation of a free church was given, and in 1850 the church numbered fifty pastors and about fifty thousand members.

Similar movements took place also outside of Prussia, in Saxony, Hesse, Baden. Perhaps no separation from the State church made a deeper impression than that of Theodor Harms at Hermannsburg, a brother of Ludwig Harms. The reason was neither dogmatical nor constitutional. Some changes were introduced by the government in the wedding formulas. Harms refused to accept those changes, and was suspended Jan. 22, 1878. He immediately formed an independent congregation, which in a short time numbered thirty-one hundred members. Meanwhile the relations between the Separate Lutherans and
those Lutherans who had remained in the State Church was often very unpleasant, and bitter controversies arose. Finally disensions broke out, even within the party itself. In 1538 Diedrich, pastor of Jabel, suddenly directed a violent attack against Huscik; and on July 8, 1552, his partisans convened a synod at Magdeburg (the so-called Immanuel Synod), which condemned the synod of Breslau, and would have no community with its members. A similar split was caused in Saxony by the Missouri Synod. In 1547 Professor Walther from Saxony formed the synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other States, which proved very successful, in the United States of America. Some congregations of Separate Lutherans, holding no ecclesiastical positions; and in every relation of convenee a synod at Magdeburg (the so-called of Bern. He held various other scholastic and teaching as ordinary professor in the university of Bern, Tubingen, and Gottingen; in 1812 was professor in the gymnasium, ministry; in 1812 was professor in the gymnasium, and rector of the litera school of Bern; in 1824 he took a pastoship, but in 1833 he resumed education at Byfield, Mass., Feb. 28, 1797; d. at South Hadley, Mass., March 5, 1848. After her education at Byfield, near Newburyport, Mass., and teaching at Ashfield, she joined Miss Z. P. Grant (afterwards Mrs. Banister) in the Adams Female Academy at Londonderry (now Derry), N.H, 1824—28; went to London, Eng., Sept., 1844. On her return to America: in 1848—49 she removed to Ipswich in the

**LYCIA.** A region of Asia Minor, stretching along the Mediterranean coast, from Caria in the west to Pamphylia in the east, opposite the Island of Rhodes. After the fall of the Seleucids, it made itself independent, became very prosperous (as the ruins of its cities, Patara and Myra, testify), and exercised no small influence on Eastern politics (1 Mace. xiv. 23). Under the reign of Claudius it was conquered by the Romans; and was a Roman province when Paul visited it (Acts xxxi. 1, xxvii. 5).

**LYD'DA,** the Greek name of the Hebrew Lod, a town belonging to the tribe of Ephraim, on the road from Joppa to Jerusalem. It is mentioned in the New Testament (Acts ix. 32) as the place in which St. Peter healed the paralytic near St. Peter's church. The church was often very unpleasant, and bitter controversies arose. Anions the bishops present at Nicea was also one of that synod; and in the beginning of the sixteenth century the see seems to have been removed or abolished. According to legend, it was the birthplace of St. George; and Justinian built a church there in his honor. The church was afterwards burnt by the Moslems, then rebuilt by the crusaders, and finally destroyed by Saladin in 1196.

**LYD'IA.** See LUd.

**LYD'lUS** is the name of a Dutch family, which, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, produced several prominent theologians. — Martin Lydius, b. in Lubeck, 1539 or 1540; d. at Franeker, June 27, 1601; studied at Tubingen, and obtained in 1566 an appointment at the Collegium Sapientiae in Heidelberg, but gave up that position after the accession of the strictly Lutheran Ludwig VI., 1578, and was appointed pastor in Amsterdam in 1580, and professor at Franeker in 1583. He wrote, besides other works, a book on the Waldenses (Waldensia), of which the first volume appeared at Rotterdam, 1616, and the second at Dort, 1617. See BAYLE: Dict., iii. 114.

**LYN. LyN.** Mary, founder of Mount Holyoke Female Seminary; b. in Buckland, Franklin County, Mass., Feb. 28, 1797; d. at South Hadley, Mass., March 5, 1848. After her education at Byfield, near Newburyport, Mass., and teaching at Ashfield, she joined Miss Z. P. Grant (afterwards Mrs. Banister) in the Adams Female Academy at Londonderry (now Derry), N.H, 1824—28; went with her when she removed to Ipswich in the latter year, and remained there when she seriously set out upon the establishment of a female seminary of high standard, decidedly and professedly Christian in character, and with such charges that those of moderate means could avail themselves of its advantages. The scheme seemed chimerical to many, particularly since one of the elements of it was that the domestic work was to be done by the pupils themselves, and another, that the teachers were to be paid very low salaries, and were to consider their work as essentially missionary. Enough money was finally collected to insure the work. On Oct. 3, 1836, the cornerstone of the building was laid at South Hadley; and Nov. 8, 1837, although the building...
LYRA.

was hardly completed, the seminary was opened. She brought to the realization of her cherished scheme, health, enthusiasm, sound common sense, a noble intellect, definite intentions, indifference to worldly things, and eminent piety. For twelve years, till her death, she was principal of the institution, and thus moulded hundreds according to a noble and Christian plan. The seminary has ever been a nursery of missionaries, and to-day maintains its reputation for piety and efficiency, and is her fitting monument. See her Life by President Edward Hitchcock, Northampton, 1851; new ed., abridged and in some parts enlarged. New York [1858].

LYRA, Nicolaus de, b. at Lyre, a village in the diocese of Evreux, Normandy, at an unknown date; d. in Paris, Oct. 23, 1340. In 1291 he entered the Franciscan order at Verneuil, and was sent to Paris to study. After taking his degree as D.D., he taught there with great distinction, and was in 1325 made provincial of his order in Burgundy. Among his works are De Messia (a defence of Christianity against Judaism), Traclatus de ... sacramentum, etc. But the work which made his name was his Postilla in V. et N. Testamentum, first printed in Rome (1471—72, 5 vols. fol.), next in Venice under the title Biblia sacra Latina cum postillis (1540, 4 vols. fol.), afterwards often. It is the most, if not the only, important monument of mediæval exegesis before the revival of classical learning. In contradiction to most theologians among the schoolmen, Lyra understood both Greek and Hebrew (on account of his thorough knowledge of Hebrew though without sufficient reason); and his linguistic knowledge offered him a sounder basis for exegesis, and raised him above many prejudices and fancies. He made a deep impression on Luther: nevertheless, the well-known saying, St Lyra non lyrassel, Lutherus non sallassel (Luther had not played, Lyra had not danced), accredits a much too great influence to the work.

LYSA'NIAS. See ABILENE.

LYS'TRA, a city of Lycaonia, probably the present Bin-bar-Kilixeh; was visited twice by Paul, the first time in company with Barnabas (Acts xiv.), the second time in company with Silas (Acts xvi.). It was probably the birthplace of Timothy (2 Tim. iii. 11).

LYTE, Henry Francis, the author of "Abide with me, fast falls the eventide;" b. at Kelso, Ireland, June 1, 1793; d. at Nice, November 20, 1847. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin; ordained in 1815; and after serving as curate near Wexford in Marazion, and Lymington, Hants, in 1823, he entered upon the perpetual curacy of Lower Brixham, Devon, a place on the channel-coast of England, and held the position till death. Up to 1818 he was unconverted; but, having been sent for by a brother-clergyman who was dying in a similarly unhappy state, he realized the wickedness and anomaly of his situation. The two instituted an earnest study of the Scriptures, and were changed in the spirit of their minds. Lyte began a life of devotion and spiritual fervor. His parish at Brixham was composed of sailors and fishermen, but he wrought very successfully among them. It is, however, as a hymn-writer that he is famous. He showed his poetical gifts in boyhood. In 1826 he published Tales upon the Lord's Prayer; in 1833, Poems chiefly Religious; in 1834, The Spirit of the Psalms, a metrical version; in 1846 edited Poems of Henry Vaughan, with a Memoir. Some of his hymns have attained a wide currency, such as "My trust is in the Lord," "Praise, Lord, for thee," "God of mercy, God of grace." But his best-known hymn is "Abide with me, fast falls the eventide." This was composed, it is said, on the evening of his last Sunday with his beloved flock at Lower Brixham, to whom he had, in great bodily weakness, addressed solemn words of parting, and administered the Lord's Supper. He gave the hymn, with the music he had adapted to it, to a dear relative, immediately upon its completion. See J. Miller: Singers and Songs of the Church, pp. 431-433.

LYTTLETON, George, Baron; b. at Hagley, Worcestershire, Jan. 17, 1709; d. there Aug. 22, 1773. He was educated at Eton and Oxford; in 1744 was a lord-commissioner of the treasury; in 1754, a member of the privy council; in 1758, chancellor of the exchequer; raised to the peerage Nov. 19, 1756, as Baron Lyttleton of Frankley. He is well known as the author of Observations on the Conversion and Apostleship of St. Paul (London, 1747, frequently reprinted) and Dialogues of the Dead (1790). The first treatise is called by Leland (Deistical Writers) "a demonstration sufficient to prove Christianity to be a divine revelation;" and by Johnson, "a treatise to which infidelity has never been able to fabricate a specious answer." It is based upon the proposition that "the conversion and apostleship of Paul, alone, duly considered, is of itself a demonstration sufficient to prove the truth of Christianity." The proof of it is derived "from the history, circumstances, station, and hopes of Paul as a Jew, an enemy, a persecutor. No motives can seriously be assigned for his conversion to a despised faith, save an irresistible conviction of the truth of the miraculous history which he has recorded." He published a History of Henry II., 1764-71. His Memoirs and Correspondence appeared London, 1845, 2 vols.
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